

Environment Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5156 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING A CLIMATE CHANGE SUPERFUND.

Vote Date: 3/4/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/20/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Environment Committee

CO-SPONSORS:

Sen. Saud Anwar, 3 rd Dist.	Rep. Steven Winter, 94th Dist.
Rep. Anne M. Hughes, 135th Dist.	Rep. Josh Elliott, 88th Dist.
Rep. Geraldo C. Reyes, 75th Dist.	Rep. Mary M. Mushinsky, 85th Dist.
Rep. Kenneth Gucker, 138th Dist.	Rep. Nicholas Menapace, 37th Dist.
Rep. Eleni Kavros DeGraw, 17th Dist.	Rep. Anthony L. Nolan, 39th Dist.
Rep. Laurie Sweet, 91st Dist.	Rep. Nick Gauthier, 38th Dist.
Rep. Frank Smith, 118th Dist.	Sen. Julie Kushner, 24th Dist.
Rep. Amy Morrin Bello, 28th Dist.	Rep. Renee LaMark Muir, 36th Dist.
Rep. Patricia A. Dillon, 92nd Dist.	Rep. Michael "MJ" Shannon, 117th Dist.
Rep. Matt Blumenthal, 147th Dist.	Rep. Gary A. Turco, 27th Dist.
Rep. Kate Farrar, 20th Dist.	Rep. Aundre Bumgardner, 41st Dist.
Rep. Brandon Chafee, 33rd Dist.	Rep. Jillian Gilchrest, 18th Dist.
Rep. Eilish Collins Main, 146th Dist.	Rep. Mike Demicco, 21st Dist.

REASONS FOR BILL:

To establish a climate change superfund that fossil fuel companies would pay into for the damages caused by climate change over the past thirty years. This fund would be administered by DEEP, and would be used for certain adaptive infrastructure projects

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Paul Aresta, Executive Director, Council on Environmental Quality

The Council supports this bill, as it would create a fund administered by DEEP to provide funding for climate change adaptation. The Council strongly supports the provisions that

would require DEEP to assess the adaptation needs and vulnerabilities of areas vital to the state's economy, normal functioning and the health and well-being of state residents; identify potential, proposed and ongoing climate adaptive infrastructure projects throughout the state; identify opportunities for alignment with existing federal, state and local funding streams; consult with stakeholders, including local governments, businesses, environmental advocates, relevant subject area experts and environmental justice communities; and provide opportunities for public engagement in all regions of the state, including, but not limited to, environmental justice communities and other communities that have the most significant exposure to the impacts of climate change.

Senator Saud Anwar, State of Connecticut, 3rd Dist.

Senator Anwar supports this bill because of the harm climate change disasters have and will do to Connecticut farmers. With more severe and unpredictable weather caused by climate change, farmers must deal with lost crops, and invest in new technology to combat the weather. Connecticut risks losing multigenerational farms because of the costs associated with these severe weather events. This bill would identify the entities most responsible for historic greenhouse gas emissions and ensures they contribute to the costs of climate adaptation. This is basic fairness. The entities that profited most from climate change should help fund solutions and resilience efforts now required across our state. This bill would help channel this money into projects that protect farmland, enhance stormwater infrastructure, preserve soil health, and support the agricultural economy. By supporting this bill, it sends a message that the Environment Committee is prepared to invest in their ability to endure and thrive in the years ahead.

Alicea Charamut, Executive Director, Rivers Alliance of Connecticut

The Rivers Alliance of Connecticut supports this bill because our rivers, drinking water systems, wastewater infrastructure, and state budget are already absorbing the escalating costs of climate change and these costs are accelerating. On August 18th, 2024, catastrophic flooding in Naugatuck Valley devastated communities. Infrastructure was destroyed and lives were lost. Federal assistance totaled \$6 million, and homeowners' insurance claims exceeded \$2.5 million. Climate change is placing extraordinary pressure on drinking water treatment plants, wastewater treatment facilities, pump stations and interceptors, stormwater systems, dams, and flood control structures. Many of these facilities were built decades ago and were never designed for today's rainfall intensity or sea level conditions. Flooding and excessive rainfall damages these systems. Along the coast, saltwater intrusion threatens drinking water and wastewater facilities. The costs to deal with these problems are enormous. At the same time, utilities already struggle to finance replacement for aging pipes and treatment systems. Existing state and federal funding programs are not sufficient to meet the current needs. This bill recognizes the principal that entities that contribute most significantly to climate pollution should help pay for the damage and adaptation. The superfund would act as an Extended Producer Responsibility. This means it creates a framework for fossil fuel companies to contribute to flood resilience projects, drinking water protection and wastewater facility upgrades, nature-based flood mitigation, and community adaptation strategies. The Rivers Alliance strongly supports the bill's emphasis on nature based solutions like restored floodplains and wetlands. Without new and equitable funding solutions, the burden will continue to fall on taxpayers and ratepayers. This bill would ensure that the companies most responsible for climate disasters contribute to helping those most impacted.

Teresa Eickel, Executive Director, Interreligious Eco- Justice Network

The Interreligious Eco-Justice Network is a faith-based organization that works with religious communities on environmental issues, such as climate change, toxic pollution, and biodiversity loss. They support this as they are frontline responders to recent climate disasters. They open their houses of worship to provide shelter for those in need. They also raise money to help rebuild after disasters. This fund will reduce the strain on ratepayers and municipalities by requiring fossil fuel companies who are responsible to contribute to resilience projects. The residents of Connecticut are already paying for climate change in energy bills and taxes. The fossil fuel companies make trillion of dollars every year, and they should be paying the costs.

Nathan Frohling, Director of External Affairs, The Nature Conservancy in CT

The Nature Conservancy supports this bill as it would require large fossil fuel companies to pay for critical projects. It will also bolster the states ongoing legal action against ExxonMobil and will aid in neighboring states efforts to hold large polluters accountable. Across the country, support for polluter accountability is broad and consistent. The money that is paid by the fossil fuel companies would address environmental resilience, adaptation, and restoration. This bill is important today as actions to repeal the 2009 Endangerment Finding are underway. This is significant as it would remove the legal basis for regulating greenhouse gas emissions. Often over the last decade, courts have dismissed lawsuits against the oil and gas industry by saying that the issue of climate culpability should be decided by legislatures. Connecticut is already seeing significant climatic changes. Sea levels could rise to 20 inches and increase flooding due to heavy rainfall. NOAA has stated that tropical cyclones have caused \$5-10 billion dollars in damages since 1980. These damages will only increase as more extreme storms will happen.

Meg Hourigan, Co-founder, CT Food System Alliance

The CT Food System Alliance supports this bill because companies that put toxic materials into the atmosphere should be held accountable for the damage it causes. Connecticut residents are bearing the cost of these increasingly severe storms. Every person living here and every corporation operating in Connecticut is responsible to one another, and this includes a responsibility to treat our soils, water, and air with respect and care so that we can continue to live and work on this land for many generations. Corporations will do everything in their power to fight this, but the risk of doing nothing on climate change is even greater. The money from this fund is deeply needed in minority communities where the pollution is concentrated.

Kendall Keelen, Staff Attorney, Conservation Law Foundation (CFL)

The CFL supports this bill because it ensures that fossil fuel companies pay their fair share. Scientists have proved what fossil fuel companies knew for decades, that fossil fuel emissions cause extreme weather. Emissions-driven weather events have caused billions of dollars in damages to the state, yet global emissions continue to rise, and these events will only get worse. Modeled after the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, this bill would authorize DEEP to collect payments from “responsible parties”. By definition, “responsible parties” do not include Connecticut’s small fuel dealers, but rather the world’s largest fossil fuel companies with substantial ties to the state. DEEP must then assess the total cost to the state for the emissions that occurred during the covered period and issue “cost recovery demands” to responsible parties. Cost

recovery demands are one-time payments. Economists, agree that, therefore, customers will not experience prices increases because prices are set globally and market competition disincentivizes cost shifting. DEEP must then adopt regulations to accept applications for eligible “climate change infrastructure adaptation projects,” ensuring that no less than 40% of the funds serve the state’s environmental justice communities. CFL supports this legislation and recommends the following improvements (See testimony for full analysis).

- CLF recommends that DEEP maintains the authority to further define project eligibility.
- CLF recommends that the Committee clarify that the liability for responsible parties extends only to sufficient business connections with the state to satisfy the “substantial nexus” constitutional requirement.
- CLF recommends that DEEP publish the public registry.
- CLF recommends that the Committee extend the period of time for DEEP to issue cost recovery demands because the department must complete its assessment of climate-related damages before it can calculate liability shares.
- CLF recommends that the Committee clarify that parties shall be responsible for the operation and maintenance of climate change adaptive infrastructure projects.
- CLF recommends that the Committee include an enforcement mechanism for responsible parties that fail to pay their cost recovery demands or enter into an agreement with DEEP to pay in installments.
- CLF recommends that the Committee provide additional funding to the department to effectuate this program and fund.

Kaitlyn Kimball, Farmer, Sunset Farm

Kaitlyn supports this bill because as a farmer, she has experienced loss and damage due to climate related weather events. At their farm, a hailstorm destroyed three of their greenhouses, and a frost in May destroyed many crops. Other damages due to extreme weather has also occurred and in total, lost over \$150,000 of damages. In 2023 and 2024, CT farmers reported \$70 million dollars in damages. She recognizes the risks in agriculture, but farmers are noticing more frequent extreme weather because of climate change.

Joyce Leiz, Executive Director, Connecticut Audubon Society

The Connecticut Audubon Society supports this bill because it provides a toolkit to combat climate change. They include

- Acquiring land in areas that store significant carbon and support bird populations
- Restoration of coastal wetlands which store more carbon per acre than any other in the state while protecting communities from storm surges
- Maintain large carbon-storing forest blocks
- Urban forestry

James Malcolm, GIS and Regulatory Specialist, New England Hydropower Company (NEHC)

The NEHC supports this bill because of the over 4,000 dams in the state, many of them face serious concerns in the face of climate change. This bill addresses the need for adaptive infrastructure like handling flooding and water treatment plants. Dams are necessary for hydropower, water intake, flood control, and maintaining spawning habitat. The National

Inventory of Dams noted that 79 dams in CT are in poor condition. A failure associated with the Kinneytown Dam in Naugatuck in 2024 caused a two-month shutdown of the Metro-North line resulting in \$11 million in repairs. This bill would bring investment and job growth to companies like NEHC in CT and offer financial relief to municipalities.

Amy Blaymore Paterson, Executive Director, CT Land Conservation Council (CLCC)

CLCC supports this bill because it holds fossil fuel companies accountable, and funds climate projects with that money. Climate change disproportionately affects vulnerable communities. Ensuring that investments prioritize equitable outcomes will help strengthen resilience. The CLCC supports the bills emphasis on nature-based solutions as part of these climate resilience strategies. Protecting and restoring ecosystems along with infrastructure is extremely important.

Alex Rodriguez, Environmental Justice Specialist, Save the Sound

Save the Sound supports this bill, as it would create a cost recovery program that would be comprised of a one-time fee on industry organizations responsible for greenhouse gas emissions that a driving climate change. Connecticut communities are already paying the price of climate change. 61% of residents live in coastal communities experiencing chronic flooding and regions outside of historic flood zones are now starting to experience dangerous flood events. A study by the National Resources Defense Council found that Connecticut homeowners are paying the most for flood repair costs compared to other states. The report shows that Connecticut homeowners can often expect to pay an average of more than \$283,000 in repairs over the course of a 30-year mortgage on homes with prior flood damage. More must be done to improve the resilience of our coastline. Some examples include.

1. Living shorelines
2. Oyster reefs for wave energy mitigation
3. Green infrastructure
4. Dam removal

Connecticut shouldn't have to pay for the consequences of the fossil fuel industries pollution. This bill would follow in New York and Vermont's leads by creating a state-specific assessment, along with a list of projects that would be best suited to keep the residents of Connecticut safe. Reports have stated that oil and gas corporations knew as early as 1968 that significant environmental damage would result from burning fossil fuels. These corporations should be held accountable for the damage they knowingly caused, and polls have shown that 74% of voters in Connecticut agree that oil and gas corporations should pay for the environmental damage they caused.

Rachel Rothschild, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Michigan

Rachel supports this bill, as there are other state and federal environmental laws thus require polluters to assist with mitigating the long-term effects from their activities. Rachel is an expert in environmental law and who studies the constitutionality of state climate superfunds, she would like to inform the legislators that this bill is consistent with existing legal precedents on the constitutionality of similar environmental legislation. Case law regarding the preemptive effect of federal legislation like the Clean Air Act does not suggest that federal law precludes Connecticut from enacting this bill. The text and legislative history of the Clean Air Act as well as judicial precedent support state authority to control air pollution more stringently than the federal government. It would thus pose no obstacle to an EPA permitting process for ongoing greenhouse gas emissions, and it does not improperly control emissions from out-of-state

sources. Nor do prior cases on due process and the dormant commerce clause suggest that HB 05156 would violate the U.S. Constitution. Furthermore, so long as a company has sufficient minimum contacts with the state, such as engaging in the marketing, sale, or distribution of fossil fuels to in-state purchasers, a court should find jurisdiction proper given the relationship between fossil fuels and climate change harms. She has attached a detailed analysis of the legal issues involved in her full testimony.

Kimberly Stoner, Director of Advocacy- CT Northeast Organic Farming Association (NOFA)

CT NOFA supports this legislation because fossil fuel companies would pay for the damage done by their past emissions. This money would then be put into climate projects, such as agriculture, to help farmers adapt to climate change. The Climate Superfund would not increase energy costs for consumers because as Nobel Prize winning economist Joseph Stiglitz explains, Superfund fees are based on companies past pollution, not current or future production. Because these fees are fixed and retrospective, they cannot be passed on to consumers without reducing corporate profits. This ensures polluters pay for past damages without increasing oil and gasoline prices or electric bills for families. Farmers must deal with more erratic weather, and the 2023-2024 season, those damages came up to \$82.3 million in uninsured losses. Even though farmers have widely varying needs, rapid financial relief is almost always needed. Farmers also need money to adapt their farms to climate change, and this bill would provide the money to do both things.

The following people and organizations all expressed support for this bill as well.

Miriam Theroux, Deputy Mayor, Rocky Hill

Christian Herb, President, CT Energy Marketers Association

Alan Siniscalchi, President, CT Association of Conversation and Inland Wetlands Commissions, Inc.

Mary Woolsey, Chair, New Haven Environmental Advisory Council

Chris Schweitzer, Director, New Haven Leon SCP

Anne Schmidt, Environment & Climate Legislative Specialist, League of Women Voters of Connecticut

Lilliana Sarju, Policy & Outreach Coordinator, CT League of Conservation Voters

Daniel Rabin, Chair, Branford Clean Energy Committee

Carolyn Mattoon, Chair, Sharon Environment Commission

Zak Leavy, Deputy Director, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)

Elliot Faulkner, Environmental Geologist

176 Citizens Also Expressed Support

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Peter Brennan, Executive Director- New England Convenience Store & Energy Marketers Association (NECSEMA)

NECSEMA represents convenience stores and gasoline retailers, independent transportation fuel distributors, and the businesses which supply them. NECSEMA opposes this bill

because the people who will ultimately pay for these bills are Connecticut residents. The tax that the bill seeks to levy on energy producers will ultimately be paid by every business and person that participates in the sale of petroleum. These costs will be passed on in the form of higher energy prices, transportation costs, and goods inflation. This will result in a regressive tax that will fall disproportionately on low-income households and small businesses. Their retailers already know that that consumers are stretched thin due to inflation, high interest rates, record utility prices, and a cooling job market. NECSEMA also represents retailers in Vermont which has passed its 2024 Climate Change Superfund Act, which has triggered multiple legal challenges. If this bill is enacted, Connecticut will face the same legal hurdles and litigation expenses. These funds would be better spent on programs like Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness grant program or to reduce utility costs for consumers.

Michael Criss, First Selectman- Town of Harwinton

First Selectman Michael Criss opposed this bill as it is currently written. He supports climate resilience efforts, yet this proposal comes at a time when Connecticut residents and municipalities are already facing unsustainable energy costs. Families already must make the difficult choices between utilities, housing, food, and health care. Local governments are also facing the same financial pressures associated with high energy costs. The concern for this bill is that the fossil fuel companies will pass these costs onto the consumers. At the same time, current assistance programs do not always reach those who need them most. Many are based on gross income rather than net income which does not reflect what families make after taxes. As a result, working households who are clearly struggling often do not qualify for support. Affordability policies should prioritize eligibility based on net income. Instead, the state should focus on lowering the burden on ratepayers. Climate initiatives are important, but they must be implemented in a way that does not further strain residents and municipalities.

Jack DeOliveira, Director of Policy- Yankee Institute

The Yankee Institute opposes this bill because of the significant economic, legal, and fiscal risks associated with establishing a state-level climate change superfund. This bill would impose substantial financial obligations on certain industries based on what they did in the past. This would create legal uncertainty and economic consequences that would extend beyond these businesses. This would result in higher energy prices for consumers, as the energy producers would pass on the increased cost down the energy supply chain. There are also concerns about competitiveness, as imposing this could discourage investment in the state and complicate interstate commerce. In addition, the legal complexities of implementing this fund would require significant state resources, as multi-year legal disputes are likely. Finally, this would create hardship on municipalities as they are already deal with constrained budgets. Connecticut should continue pursuing climate resilience; however, they should be structured in a way that does not hurt consumers and creates economic competitiveness.

Michael Giaimo, NE Regional Director, American Petroleum Institute (API)

Giaimo, opposes the bill, arguing it is unfair, legally questionable, and economically harmful. The main points are: **Retroactive law making:** The bill penalizes companies for actions that were legal decades ago, which may be unconstitutional. **Law may be contrary to excessive fines and takings clauses:** It could violate constitutional protections (like excessive fines, takings, and due process) due to large, imprecise, and potentially arbitrary penalties. **Arbitrary penalties and estimated fines create due process and fairness issues:** The state cannot accurately calculate past emissions, making it unfair to base massive fines on

estimates. **State played a role in products being demanded and delivered:** Fossil fuels were legally produced to meet demand encouraged by the state and used widely by society, including government. **This bill runs contrary to prior positions taken by other legislatures:** The bill conflicts with past legislative positions recognizing the importance of oil and gas to the economy and public welfare. **No nexus between fine and actual responsibility:** It does not clearly connect specific companies' emissions to environmental or health damages. **Improper use of strict liability standard:** It targets producers rather than end users and disproportionately singles out certain companies. **Disproportionate penalties:** Domestic companies could bear more costs than foreign competitors, putting them at a disadvantage. **Preemption:** Climate and emissions issues are global and governed by federal law, so the bill may be overridden by federal authority. In conclusion, API argues the bill unfairly punishes energy companies for past legal activities, relies on uncertain data, and may not withstand legal challenges.

Andy Markowski, State Director-National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB)

NFIB opposes this bill because Connecticut's small businesses simply cannot afford higher energy, heating, or fueling costs. NFIB represents small businesses, and these employers rely on affordable and reliable energy to heat their facilities. For businesses already facing some of the highest energy costs in the region, an additional price pressure could be catastrophic. NFIB's most recent national Small Business Energy Survey shows that 80% of small business owners say energy costs already significantly impact their business. Nearly 6 out of 10 are absorbing those increases through lower profits, and more than half are forced to raise prices. Small businesses have very few tools to offset rising energy costs. Only 8% were able to switch to a cheaper energy source. For most, there simply is no easy alternative. Finally, NFIB is also concerned about the retroactive nature of HB-5156, which imposes strict liability dating back nearly 30 years. Regulatory predictability and risk tolerance is essential to maintaining a stable economic climate.

Senator Jeff Gordon, State of Connecticut, 35th District

State Senator Jeff Gordon opposes H.B. 5156 arguing it would increase financial burdens on Connecticut residents, businesses, and municipalities. He warns the bill could lead to billions in added costs that would likely be passed on through higher energy bills, taxes, and prices. He also highlights a broader concern that environmental proposals—like one involving electric leaf blowers—can create unintended economic impacts, especially for small businesses and local governments. Sen. Gordon emphasizes the need to address climate issues with practical, cost-conscious solutions that do not worsen the state's affordability challenges. He urges lawmakers to reconsider the bill and pursue approaches that balance environmental goals with economic stability.

Christian Herb, President, CT Energy Marketers Association

The CT Energy Marketers Association opposes this bill because there are already numerous taxes on these same fuels. The cost of this superfund would ultimately fall on consumers, which would amount to an estimated 33 cent-per-gallon increase. This extra 33cpg would erode the number of gallons that energy assistance recipients receive. They see that their customers are struggling, as they often stretch their heating payments out 60-90 days. The companies that would be subject to this new tax will pass them on like every other tax. In fact, in 1987, Connecticut courts said in *Texaco Refining & Marketing Co. v. Commissioner of Revenue Services* that the company was allowed to pass on the petroleum gross earnings tax (also known in the State Budget as the Oil Company Tax). Finally, the Committee should

be aware that when New York passed their Climate Superfund, it resulted in 22 states suing them over its constitutionality. Connecticut can expect the same if it passes.

Byson Hull, Deputy Northeast Director, Consumer Energy Alliance (CEA)

The CEA opposes this bill because it does not deliver on affordable, reliable, and clean energy. This would just be a massive tax on Connecticut residents. The Climate Superfund laws of Vermont and New York, which this one is modeled after, is already being challenged in court. Using New York's cost analysis as a benchmark, we analyzed Connecticut's documented fuel use according to U.S. Energy Information Administration. With this conservative method, the numbers are staggering: a roughly \$45 billion cost, about \$25 billion for gasoline and the remainder for the natural gas and oil used to bring us electricity from 1995 to 2024. This is simple math grounded in H.B. 5156's 30-year timeframe and federal data on how much fuel Connecticut used over that time. Traditional fuels have provided 80% of global energy supply for decades, according to the International Energy Agency, and that reality is not changing any time soon. That number holds in Connecticut – where more than 78% of homes are heated by natural gas, propane, and oil, according to U.S. Census data. A further 18% are heated by electricity, more than half of which in this state is generated by natural gas and oil.

Peter Myers, Senior Policy Director, Connecticut Business & Industry Association (CBIA)

CBIA opposes this bill due to the economic costs it would have on Connecticut businesses. They are concerned that the costs imposed on the fossil fuel companies will be passed down to Connecticut residents. Connecticut ranks as one of the highest in energy costs in the nation. As of November 2025, industrial rates were 110% higher than the rest of the nation. Small and medium-sized businesses lack the ability to absorb rising costs, which would end up raising prices for consumers. CBIA wants to support solutions that allow for greater investment into resiliency measures for businesses. They encourage the committee to examine legislation to expand C-PACE through the Connecticut Green Bank as a market-based solution. The business community also supports the creation of a disaster savings account to provide tax benefit to employers who proactively invest in resiliency and emergency preparedness.

Jessica Olander, President- Conn. River Valley Chamber (CRVCC)

The CRVCC opposes this bill because it would have unintended consequences on Connecticut's economy. CRVCC supports the efforts to protect the state's environment, however this fund would create a cumbersome scheme that could impose significant costs through recovery payments from responsible parties to fund infrastructure projects. This bill could subject businesses to costly litigation based on unclear standards that could hinder economic growth. CRV Chamber members are already operating in one of the most expensive regulatory environments in the nation. Connecticut employers face high energy and labor costs, steep tax burdens, and competitive pressures from neighboring states. Creating a new funding mechanism that potentially relies on contributions from employers or assessments tied to corporate activity will add a new layer of cost and administrative complexity. **Impact on Small and Mid-Sized Employers:** While large corporations may have dedicated compliance staff, small and midsized businesses generally do not. **Risk to Jobs and Economic Development:** Connecticut's economic recovery depends on a thriving private sector that creates jobs and tax revenue. Any policy that increases operational costs or introduces uncertainty about future fees will constrain job creation at a time when

employers are still rebuilding post-pandemic and meeting workforce needs. **Existing Infrastructure Funding Mechanisms:** Connecticut already has several effective mechanisms for infrastructure investment, such as Clean Water and Drinking Water funds, Local Capital Improvement Projects, and federal infrastructure grants such as state drinking water revolving fund.

Vincent Pace, Assistant General Counsel, Eversource Energy

Eversource opposes this bill because they are concerned it will raise energy costs on Connecticut residents. Eversource is concerned because the payments the Bill requires fossil fuel producers to contribute to a state-run climate adaptation fund may be recouped by those fossil fuel producers in the costs, they charge power plant owners for natural gas and oil. That development is impactful for Connecticut because ISO New England Inc. (“ISO-NE”), reported that approximately 51% of the electricity used in New England in 2025 was generated by natural gas-fired power plants and approximately 1% was from oil-fired power plants.¹ But ISO-NE’s reliance on oil-fired power plants increases during cold weather periods such as the recent cold snap in January-February 2026. Because of the close correlation between natural gas prices and wholesale electricity prices in New England, Eversource is concerned that a consequence of this Bill could be to increase supply costs for Connecticut consumers who already pay some of the highest supply rates in the country because of the deregulated supply market.

Susan Pronovost, Executive Director, CT Greenhouse Growers Association

The CT Greenhouse Growers Association opposes this bill due to concerns of its unintended downstream consequences for farmers and food producers. Even though this bill targets fossil fuel companies, there are fears that the agricultural sector could bear a significant burden of the cost. Energy, fuel, fertilizer, plastics, transportation, and refrigeration are essential farm and greenhouse inputs. Any cost recovery demand imposed on upstream energy and refining entities will inevitably be passed down the supply chain, increasing costs for farms already under severe financial pressure. The bills language mentions farming as a sector that is harmed by climate change, but farmers are implementing climate-adaptive practices. This legislation creates a centralized funding mechanism controlled by DEEP, with no guaranteed allocation to working lands, on-farm resilience, or producer-led adaptation projects. There is no assurance that funds extracted from agriculture-dependent supply chains will be reinvested in ways that directly benefit farms. Connecticut Greenhouse Growers Association supports and participates in climate adaptation and on-farm resilience measures.

Stephen Sack, Owner, Sack Energy Corp

Stephen is in opposition of this bill because it would unfairly charge companies for actions, they did 30 years ago which were licensed by Federal and State regulators. Not all crude oil that is refined is in a way that creates greenhouse gases. On average, 15% of crude oil that is refined is used as asphalt oils, greases, and mineral oils. Many of the largest refining companies in the world are state owned. How will Connecticut collect fees from Russia, Mexico, Venezuela, China, India, and other companies.

20 Citizens Also Expressed Opposition

