TESTIMONY OF
LEODOLOFF R. ASUNCION, JR.
CHAIR, PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
STATE OF HAWAII

TO THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND TOURISM

Tuesday, January 31, 2023
1:00 p.m.

Chair DeCoite, Vice Chair Wakai, and Members of the Committee:

MEASURE: S.B. No. 72
TITLE: RELATING TO RENEWABLE ENERGY.

DESCRIPTION: Requires the Public Utilities Commission to render decisions on certain renewable projects, power purchase agreements, and cost recovery applications within one hundred and eighty days of the filing of the application. Exempts certain power purchase agreement amendments from the Public Utilities Commission review and approval process. For ratemaking proceedings, requires the Public Utilities Commission to complete its deliberations and issue its decision before six months from the date a public utility has filed its application for approval.

POSITION:

The Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") offers the following comments for consideration.

COMMENTS:

The Commission appreciates the intent of this measure to establish deadlines for Commission decisions for certain applications in order to move the State closer to its energy goals.

Relating to Section 2a, the Commission believes it is possible to render decisions for Power Purchase Agreements ("PPAs") within one-hundred and eighty days of application filing; however, the Commission believes that such a requirement may not be necessary because it has historically achieved this review timeline in previous applications.

Specifically, in the review process for the PPAs resulting from Hawaiian Electric's two recent requests for proposals ("Stages 1 and 2 RFPs"), the Commission took on average 135 days and 157 days to render decisions for PPA applications and overhead line extension applications, respectively, excluding the three applications that resulted in contested cases or docket suspensions due to proceedings at other agencies. Furthermore, the Commission has approved a change to Hawaiian Electric's interconnection process for the upcoming RFPs whereby the Commission will be reviewing the PPA and any applicable overhead line extension in the same application. This change will reduce the process from two review phases and two Commission approvals down to one review period and one approval required, cutting down on the time that projects must await a Commission decision.

If the Legislature enacts the one-hundred and eighty-day requirement, it should consider removing either the automatic approval or the reporting requirement. The Commission finds that having both provisions in the statute would be unnecessary. The legislature might consider the following language change to Section 2a:

> If the application is not approved, approved with modification, or denied by the commission within one hundred and eighty days, ~~the matter shall be deemed approved by the commission. If a decision is not made within the one-hundred-and-eighty-day period,~~ the commission shall report the reasons therefor to the legislature and the governor in writing within thirty days after the expiration of the one hundred and eighty day period.

Relating to Section 2b, the Commission believes that exempting from Commission-approval any PPA amendment that reduces the unit price of energy or energy potential from the previously approved PPA could have negative consequences on ratepayers or the general public. For example, if a counterparty and a utility negotiate a PPA amendment that includes terms that are not in the best interest of an outside party, including the ratepayers, the Commission would not have the opportunity to review and reject such terms, if the PPA featured a reduced unit price or a reduced energy potential. Further, if a PPA reaching the end of its term could circumvent Commission approval through a PPA with a reduced unit price or reduced energy potential, this could give an unfair advantage to incumbent power producers and defy ratepayers of opportunities to reap the benefits from new PPAs that may be more cost-effective.

Relating to Section 3, the Commission believes that completing its deliberation and issuing its decision on ratemaking proceedings might be feasible in the expedited timeline pursuant to this bill (read: 6 months instead of 9 months); however, this bill does not provide additional resources or means to compensate additional staff that would be required to expedite its review processes. Especially in the case of ratemaking proceedings, allowing for increases in rates, fares and charges, without sufficient time to review the reasonableness of these increase would have negative impacts on the ratepayer. Therefore, the Commission recommends reverting the language in Section 3 to 9-months or including a budget request for additional funds and staff members to ensure the expedited deadlines can be met with proper resources to conduct the necessary due diligence.

The Commission is willing to work with the Committee and stakeholders to better streamline efforts in its review process of renewable projects.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR | KE KIA'ĀINA

SYLVIA LUKE
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR | KA HOPE KIA'ĀINA

STATE OF HAWAII | KA MOKUʻĀINA ʻO HAWAIʻI
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS
KA ʻOIHANA PILI KĀLEPA
335 MERCHANT STREET, ROOM 310
P.O. BOX 541
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809
Phone Number: (808) 586-2850
Fax Number: (808) 586-2856
cca.hawaii.gov

NADINE Y. ANDO
DIRECTOR | KA LUNA HOʻOKELE

DEAN I HAZAMA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR | KA HOPE LUNA HOʻOKELE

Testimony of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs

Before the
Senate Committee on Energy, Economic Development, and Tourism
Tuesday, January 31, 2023
1:00 p.m.
Conference Room 229

On the following measure:
S.B. 72, RELATING TO RENEWABLE ENERGY

Chair DeCoite and Members of the Committee:

My name is Dean Nishina, and I am the Acting Executive Director of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs' (Department) Division of Consumer Advocacy. The Department offers comments on this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to: 1) require the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) to render decisions on certain renewable projects, power purchase agreements, and cost recovery applications within one hundred and eighty days of the filing of the application; 2) exempts certain power purchase agreement amendments from Commission review and approval; and 3) for ratemaking proceeding, requires the Commission to complete its deliberations and issue its decision before six months from the date a public utility has filed its application for approval.

The Department offers the following observations and comments.

While the Department supports the efficient operations of government, proposed HRS § 269-_(a) in Section 2 of this bill may not address the speed at which developers

bring projects online as the Legislature states in Section 1 is its hope. The Department observes that the majority of recent power purchase agreements have been approved on a timely basis. When there have been delays in the projects reaching commercial operations, those delays relate to: 1) time required to transmit necessary project design information between the developer and utility to insure safe and reliable service; 2) issues encountered by the developer during construction after Commission proceedings are finished; 3) interconnection study issues; and 4) situations where litigation and appeals related to the project must be addressed. So, the proposed time limits of Section 2 of this bill may be difficult for the Commission to balance with its constitutional obligation to provide adequate procedural steps for those parties' due process rights, such as evidentiary hearings as well as other unintended consequences.

Given the title of the bill relates to renewable energy, to the extent that Section 3 of the bill is also meant to speed the completion of renewable energy projects, the proposed modification will not affect the timing of renewable energy projects that are subject to a purchased power agreement or self-built by utility companies. Since power purchase agreement costs are recoverable through energy cost adjustment clauses, cost recovery, rate cases do not inhibit the ability to enter into these agreements. For the Hawaiian Electric Companies, there are other surcharges that facilitate the recovery of costs that may be related to renewable energy costs, such as the exceptional project recovery mechanism and the renewable energy infrastructure surcharge. Given the pace of projects being constructed on Kauai, it is likely that the proposed changes in section 3 on the state's other electric utility, Kauai Island Utility Cooperative, would also be negligible.

If adopted, however, the proposed language to decrease the amount of time for traditional cost-of-service rate cases would adversely affect the interests of customers of all regulated industries. The Department highlights that, as proposed, it would apply to all regulated utility companies and the Department has concerns on the ability to represent, protect and advance consumers' interests if the proposed modification is adopted. In order to evaluate requested increases in rates, the Department notes that the rate case process, which includes the discovery process and hearings, is necessary

to analyze whether the requested increase is reasonable. The applications often lack sufficient documentation and evidence to support the finding that the proposed increase is reasonable and it requires time for that evidence to be produced and provided. Only after analyses, which require time and discovery to obtain needed information, are completed, the Department has been able to provide recommendations for the Commission's consideration. Under the current rules, even with its limited resources, the Department has been able to secure first-year savings exceeding $247 million over the last five fiscal years from settlements with utilities and/or Commission approved results in rate proceedings. If less time was available, those savings would likely not have been possible. The Department also respectfully urges the committee to consider that larger regulated companies and or complex requests require more time to review those applications and supporting documents, which often will be thousands of pages. For smaller utility companies, HRS 269-16f already provides an opportunity for quicker relief. Thus, restricting the time available to conduct the regulators' review will have unintended consequences that could result in all customers paying much more for their regulated utility services.

Finally, the Consumer Advocate appreciates how the proposed exemption from Commission review, entirely, for certain power purchase agreement amendments under proposed HRS § 269-_(b) would only be triggered when the amendment entails a price reduction. However, even though well-intended, the proposed amendment may not be in customers' interests. For example, when an already approved agreement reaches the end of the original term, if the new agreement reduces the rate by, say, only one penny per kWh, it would not require Commission review. Given that there have been decreases in costs of renewable projects in recent years, denying an opportunity to determine whether contract prices should be lower would mean that customers could be asked to bear higher than reasonable costs. If, however, all of the projects' costs have been recovered through the original term of the contract, allowing the new price, even at one penny less per kWh, would require customers to pay a rate that might provide the developer potentially significant profits over the new term of the amended agreement. Furthermore, other non-price terms of an amendment could create unintended risks for

utility customers. In addition, allowing such existing amended contracts to continue without review could discourage the possibility of a competitive procurement process (and eliminate the possibility of encouraging additional investment in the state and lowering energy prices). So, if this bill moves forward, the Department encourages the Legislature to consider at least removing this particular subsection so that the Commission will still have the opportunity to review all terms of power purchase agreement amendments in order to safeguard the public interest.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.

Environmental Caucus of
The Democratic Party of Hawai'i

Energy & Climate Action Committee

Tuesday, January 31, 2023, 1:00 pm

Senate Committee on Energy, Economic Development, and Tourism

SENATE BILL 72 – RELATING TO RENEWABLE ENERGY

Position: Strong Opposition

Me ke Aloha, Chair DeCoite and Vice-Chair Wakai:

SB72 sets a hard deadline for PUC decisions on certain renewable projects, power purchase agreements, and cost recovery applications.

The Environmental Caucus supports a timely permitting process by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) but not an abridged process that threatens the public interest and public values. It is not clear that SB72 is an appropriate tool in our circumstances. Facts already in the public sphere raise questions about some idealistic ideas dispensed without evidence in Section One. This bill expresses nervous concern, inviting snap judgment through a multitude of substantive and process issues, which is completely inappropriate to public decision-making.

The PUC functions with deliberate care and speed in a complex environment. It is in the public interest to proceed with due care, despite our eagerness to act promptly to avoid contributing to climate catastrophe. Advances in truly renewable, clean sources of energy and their ability to provide power 24/7 with battery storage have been coming down in price and accessibility, cheaper than carbon-emitting sources, resulting in savings for rate payers. This the direction we want to go.

The planning and action front in this effort has moved to upgrading the grid, and this poses unique challenges for the energy-providing community that the PUC must consider, without rushing to judgment to approve expensive new polluting carbon emission plants that threaten our survival and the raising of consumer electricity rates. One example that qualifies for this backward idea would actually raise electricity costs on Hawai'i Island.

Moreover, the bill lacks the essential proviso that challenges to the completeness or verity of an application should suspend or "toll" the process, even if beyond the specified time period. Automatic approval of a flawed filing has always been contrary to the public interest.

There are also some diction or punctuation anomalies that might disqualify this bill. Overall, the Caucus believes this is an inappropriate bill, and should be rejected.

Mahalo for the opportunity to address this matter.
/s/ Charley Ice & Ted Bohlen, Co-Chairs, Energy and Climate Action Committee
Environmental Caucus of the Democratic Party

SB-72
Submitted on: 1/30/2023 11:31:37 AM
Testimony for EET on 1/31/2023 1:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ted Bohlen	Testifying for Climate Protectors Hawaii	Oppose	In Person

Comments:

OPPOSE!

Testimony of Brian Barbata in support of SB72

Chair DeCoite, and members of the Committee, thank you for hearing SB 72. My name is Brian Barbata, and I was in the energy business in Hawaii for nearly 35 years. My background is both in fossil fuels and photovoltaics, which we all call "solar". I was one of the founding directors of the Kauai Island Utility Coop, when we bought it from Citizens Utilities. And I have been following alternative energy since the "second oil shock", starting in 1980.

In supporting this bill, I would like to point out that nothing in it defines what type of renewable energy is to be fast-tracked. There are two types: Variable (intermittent) and Firm (dependable).

Solar panels and batteries do not constitute a dependable electrical system. For some reason, this fact has been ignored year after year in legislation, Energy Office reports, and UH studies, and is just this month becoming the subject of an RFP from Hawaiian Electric. I'm talking about days and weeks of diminished sunlight and wind. I'm talking about tropical storms and hurricanes. I think everyone here has been in Hawaii long enough to know climate change is going to make those things more, not less, frequent and potentially more severe.

Dependability of renewable sources will depend, as Hawaiian Electric has defined it in its RFP, on "a spinning machine". They are talking about a fuel-driven generator. That's the basic technology the utility says it's going to need to keep the lights on when variable renewables like solar are down. It's called "Firm Renewable Generation", or FRG. The only likely candidate right now is biodiesel, which is derived from plant material or waste cooking oil. Currently, biodiesel is used only in a 20% mix with regular diesel fuel and experts have said there is no technology on the horizon which would have utility-scale generation using 100% pure biodiesel, even if you could get enough. If that is the solution for dependability, it will be a solution for most of the planet, making supplies scarce.

Today, fossil fuels make the machines spin and seamlessly fill in the gap. The current gap is because we don't have enough panels yet to generate all our needs. But that will end by 2045, when we will be totally reliant on variable sources of electricity, and have no fossil fuel generation. Hawaiian Electric has published a schedule of the shutdown of fossil fueled plants. Then the gap, without intervention starting NOW, will be the lack of backup when foul weather hits.

I hear a lot of misinformation and dangerous assumptions repeated weekly. One of them is, "We will have a mix of dependable renewable generation". This convenient deflection of the problem avoids the realities of fueled generation. You cannot have a mix of renewable fuels providing the backup capacity Hawaiian Electric says it will need in 2045. Even if those fuels were available, what a complex mess, with multiple contractors to the utility hoping to keep supplies in inventory and the engines running.

Another is, "We have time to figure that out". Members of the committee, we do not. It's a mere 22 years to 2045, and SB72 will help smooth the way for us to reach the 100% renewable goal by then. That is the goal for variable, intermittent sources. But that is no time at all to completely overhaul the generation and fuel supply system currently powered by fossil fuels. While Hawaiian Electric can forecast how much capacity we will need to back up a total disruption of solar power on Oahu, it cannot forecast how many days this state should plan for. Capacity is not production. Production is the number of hours and days electricity is produced. Determining that and providing laws like this one that also fast track a meteorological study and a probability forecast, on which Hawaiian Electric and the PUC can base procurement decisions, needs legislative backing. I encourage you to find a place in SB72 to start this process.

SB-72
Submitted on: 1/29/2023 3:33:12 PM
Testimony for EET on 1/31/2023 1:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mark A. Koppel	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Submitting testimony in extreme oppostion to SB72

My name is Mark Koppel. I reside at 31-372 Lepoloa Rd., Ninole HI 96773.

1. SB72 is a bill written to help only one company in the entire State of Hawaii: Hu Honua DBA Honua Ola.

It is a cynical attempt by Senate members whose motives are questioned by many of the public. Why would they push a bill aimed at only one company which is in every way a Bad Company for Hawaii?????Why??????????????????????

Their similar attempt last year was thankfully vetoed by the Governor. Yet, they keep trying to thwart public interest.

The bill seeks to Force the PUC to accept Hu Honua's PPA as long as a new rate is lower than the initial proposal. How much lower? One per cent?

HU HONUA'S ONE PPA BEFORE THE PUC SHOWS A RATE OF TRIPLE THAT OF EXISTING SOLAR PLANTS.

We hear complaints that Hawaii is hard on business.

WILL TRIPLING ELECTRIC RATES HELP US ATTRACT NEW BUSINESSES? Really?

The proponents of this bill should know they will face voter retaliation if voters' electricity bills triple. Hawaii Island voters are in contact with o'hana in O'ahu to repeat that message. You really don't want to pass this.

The bill seeks to force the PUC to rush its deliberations. WHY is this at all necessary? To push through illegal proposals? There is a "Public" in PUC which must work in the public interest, for the Lowest Rates.

Hu Honua is a for-profit proposed power plant owned by Jennie Johnson, the billionaire owner of Franklin-Templeton Funds of San Francisco. It was originally proposed as a coal-burning plant, but switched to a new model of Burning (burning produces CO2) eucalyptus trees of which there are tens of thousands of acres on Hawaii Island, most planted by the original Bishop Estate.

2. The manager of Hu Honua, Warren Lee, repeatedly says it is "carbon neutral" because it will be replanting new trees to replace the ones cut. Mr. Lee has refused to release Any details on replanting if, indeed, they even exist. Hu Honua has been in Literally constant litigation since it began planning.

a. It is a scientific Fact that trees do not begin absorbing CO2 until they are 10-30 years so old, so Hu Honua will Not be carbon neutral. Saying Hu Honua is "carbon neutral" is another "mistatement. Meanwhile, Hu Honua will be spewing out hundreds of thousands of tons of greenhouse gas, CO2 + as yet unnamed pollutants.

b. Hu Honua plans on polluting the Hakalau aquifer by taking out 21 Million Gallons of clean and putting back polluted boiler remains water per day. This is the equivalent of fracking, which has been Scientifically linked to numerous earthquakes in the Midwest and Southwest due to oil-fracking activity. Hu Honua is Literally at the edge of a cliff overlooking the ocean.

c. This "fracking" activity will pollute the ocean under Hu Honua destroying reefs and marine life.

d. The emissions from Hu Honua and its delivery trucks will directly affect a low-income project directly across Route 19.

e. With solar and wind, this plant is unwanted, unneeded and unhealthy.

f. Mr. Lee keeps "misstating" the Facts about Solar Power Generation. They are totally Firm, a word he likes to throws around. Existing batteries last far longer than the four hours Mr. Lee and some of the bill's sponsors mistate. I have been off-grid for 17 years and, believe me, my batteries keep the lights on All the Time.

For the good of Hawaii's future, for clean air, water and ocean, for Hawaii's Legislature's Ethics, SB72 must not pass.

Mahalo

Mark Koppel

SB-72
Submitted on: 1/29/2023 4:09:28 PM
Testimony for EET on 1/31/2023 1:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David Hunt	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

SB72 is, plain and simple, bad energy policy in the guise of legislative reforms. SB72 would clearly harm the advancement of lower cost, clean energy options. SB72 is anti-competitive and anti-democratic.

Why must those of us, whom you are supposed to represent, continue to point out that overriding due process is anti-democratic?

Why, when you don't like the results of due process, do you seek to supersede that due process / decision-making process?

Whatever SB72 sponsors' expressed or true motives are, SB72 is inconceivably short-sighted and contrary to the public interest.

Some claim to be focused on business, economic development, and energy security. They say they are worried about alternative energy not being reliable and seem to believe that central station biomass plants will be reliable firm power.

Some continue to intentionally propagate the incorrect statement that CLEAN renewable power (battery) storage is limited by a four hour maximum supply storage.

To continue to repeat this fallacy must be considered no less than intentionally misleading in order to serve a specific or preferred project. Solar power, with extended battery storage (at 7 to 8 cents per kwh) now successfully out-competes old technology combustion-based DIRTY "renewable" energy (at 24 to 44 cents per kwh). Further, the significantly more expensive, combustion based dirty energy (such as HH) destroys forests, soil, land, air, water, transportation infrastructure, and community tranquility.

To many of my peers, who have been involved with Hawaii energy policy, permitting, projects, and proposals, the RPS, and the financial, environmental, legal, and legislative facts and details involved therein, SB72 literally smells like yet another attempt to CIRCUMVENT the PUC (and consequently the courts) and the best interest of the public, in order to serve the sole interests of Hu Honua and its non-resident, entitled, wealthy investors.

This same HH group has demonstrated arrogant disregard for Hawaii state and county regulations and law (arrogantly building without required permits and violating state energy and

environmental policies, requirements, and laws). Hu Honua has instead used political contributions, PR misinformation campaigns, un-registered (illegal) lobbying, ad-nauseum court appeals, and good-ol-boy backroom special favors and dealings to continue to stall, delay, disrespect, and circumvent the laws, regulations, and requirements that every other modern energy facility has followed. The PUC and the courts have spent thousands of collective hours indulging this spoiled, entitled, un-restrained, tantruming child that is Hu Honua. And yet, SB72 arrives on your desk to try to decipher, understand, and decide.

Hu Honua has failed every test; regulatory, economic, public review, and legal. And yet this bill SB72 appears to be designed to by-pass all due diligence and due process measures - to grant a free pass to Hu Honua. It seems to me unconceivable, unethical, and suspect. If you have not followed Paula Dobbyn's excellent, factual, investigative reporting on Hu Honua, it is extremely important for you to read these investigative reports.

"Exempting previously approved PPA projects from PUC review" (as long as their new rates are lower than previous) will make rates demonstrably higher than they would be with competitive bidding in a time of declining costs, to the extreme detriment of business and residential ratepayers.

Supporters of Hu Honua miss the obvious fact that businesses (and residents) need power that is not only reliable, but also AFFORDABLE (which Hu Honua would NEVER be even with the loopholes that SB72 would provide to HH. Although these loopholes are not articulated directly, I do not believe that these loopholes are accidental. Further, I see no NEED for these loopholes beyond attempted special dealing / favoritism.

The PUC is required to represent the best interest of the public. If only those behind SB72 were held to the same requirement. The PUC and the district, appeals, and supreme courts have to date acted judiciously, fairly, and expediently in upholding this requirement and trust. To remove this permitting process is to remove the public's best interest.

SB72 must be exposed for what it is and stopped immediately. SB72 authors should be held responsible for this bill their actions, ESPECIALLY in this time of Legislative Ethics review, oversight, and changes to rebuild public trust.

SB-72
Submitted on: 1/29/2023 11:41:03 PM
Testimony for EET on 1/31/2023 1:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Cory Harden	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha legislators,
Please oppose SB72.
I support expedited approval of clean renewable projects backed with storage--but not for biomass, which generates greenhouse gas emissions.
I do not support exempting new PPAs from PUC review, nor shortening the time limit on rate applications. Both proposals would jack up electric bills.
mahalo, Cory Harden

SB-72
Submitted on: 1/30/2023 8:50:51 AM
Testimony for EET on 1/31/2023 1:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Keith Neal	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

SB72 is bad bill.

The Public Utilities Commission functions in the public interest with deliberate care and speed in a complex environment.

Provisions in this bill if enacted would abrogate important public safeguards.

LATE

Senate Committee on Energy, Economic Development, and Tourism
Jan. 31, 2023 at 1:00 pm

OPPOSING SB 72

My name is John Kawamoto, and I oppose SB 72.

This bill would hasten the approval of Hu Honua, a project that first submitted an application for approval 10 years ago. Hu Honua remains unapproved because it has not been able to meet PUC requirements.

This bill is based on a false assumption. In Section 1 the bill cites Hawaii's net negative emissions goal as the reason for removing barriers to approving renewable energy projects. The assumption is that all forms of renewable energy do not emit greenhouse gases.

The truth is that only some forms of renewable energy do not have emissions, and these are clean as well as renewable. An example is solar energy. Other forms of renewable energy have emissions, so they are dirty even though they are renewable.

Burning trees to generate electricity, which is what Hu Honua would do, is renewable and dirty. Burning trees generates more greenhouse gases than burning coal to produce an equivalent amount of electricity, and coal is considered to be a very dirty form of energy. As such, Hu Honua would contribute to climate change.

Although trees are technically renewable, it takes decades to re-grow a forest until it begins to sequester carbon dioxide. Climate scientists say that we have less than 10 years to take the drastic action necessary to avoid severe widespread disasters resulting from climate change.

Furthermore, Hu Honua would increase electricity rates on Hawaii Island. Hu Honua would sell electricity to Hawaiian Electric starting at 22 cents per kilowatt-hour, increasing to 44 cents per kilowatt-hour. By contrast, Hawaiian Electric is now buying electricity from the new Waikoloa Solar + Storage project on the Big Island for only 9 cents per kilowatt-hour. More clean, renewable energy is needed, not Hu Honua.

This bill will not help Hawaii reach its net negative emissions goal, and it will increase electricity rates for Hawaii Island residents. The committee should hold the bill.