

Testimony before Oregon Senate Committee on
Environment & Natural Resources
In re: SB 324
2 February 2015

Summary: Oppose Senate Bill 324

Members

Senator Chris Edwards, **Chair**
Senator Alan Olsen, **Vice-Chair**
Senator Michael Dembrow
Senator Floyd Prozanski
Senator Chuck Thompson

I wish to submit for the legislative record why I believe that low carbon fuel standards are nonsensical and should be eliminated rather than enacted.

For all the attention lavished on carbon dioxide, it is one of the least significant trace gases present. While nitrogen, oxygen, and argon together comprise more than 99% of the Earth's atmosphere, carbon dioxide is a minuscule .004% (that's four one-thousandths of one percent). Despite the prodigious efforts of all of mankind over the last 150 years (with ever more of us to boot — almost a six-fold increase), we have been unable to increase that percentage even .001%. Scientists tell us that in the past carbon dioxide made up as much as **30%** of the atmosphere. These same scientists are scared spittleless that we might reach carbon dioxide concentration of a whopping .006% in another 150 years. By the way, in order to sustain the present great plant life, carbon dioxide needs to be at least .0025% of the atmosphere. Also of note: even if mankind were to stop emissions of all of the carbon dioxide (except for natural expiration, naturally) for which we can be held responsible tomorrow, atmospheric carbon dioxide levels would continue to rise for the foreseeable future.

Aside from the lack of impact gained from a global shutdown of carbon dioxide emissions, what does mankind (or just Oregon) gain from SB 324? The United States is the fourth-largest country measured by land area in the world, calculated at 3,537,455 square miles; about 6% of the globe. Oregon takes up 98,466 square miles or about 2.5% (about 3% of just the “lower 48”) of the country's area. Whereas China, (third-largest world land area) and India (seventh-largest in world land area) continue to increase their emissions of carbon dioxide, little Oregon, covering .0015% (fifteen ten-thousandths of one percent) of the globe's surface, deems it expedient to enact regulations that purport to reduce “the average amount of greenhouse gas emissions per unit of fuel energy of the fuels by 10 percent below 2010 levels by the year 2020” (Oregon Laws 2009, Ch. 754, § 6(2)(b)(A)). Do not even the three co-sponsors of this bill who sit on this committee comprehend the utter senselessness of this proposition?

As the elected representatives of the people of Oregon you are called upon to enact legislation that enhances life for Oregonians, not burden our lives with fatuous and costly laws that serve only to appeal to Utopian imaginations of a few who believe they know better than the rest of us how we should live our lives. SB 324 should not move out of this committee.

One last note: As if to confirm the utter unreliability of contemporary media to digest and report scientific data, Bjorn Lomborg of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, writing in the *Wall Street Journal*, stated, “It is an indisputable fact that carbon emissions are rising — and faster than most scientists predicted. But many climate-change alarmists seem to claim that all climate change is worse

than expected. This ignores that much of the data are actually encouraging. The latest [study](#) from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that in the previous 15 years temperatures had risen 0.09 degrees Fahrenheit. The average of all models expected 0.8 degrees. So we're seeing about 90% less temperature rise than expected." Mr. Lomborg does not dispute that emissions of carbon-dioxide by mankind is a problem that mankind should address. So, why is there little or no mention of the fact that the margin of error assigned to this purported .09° (nine one-hundredths of one degree) increase in temperature is four times greater? In other words, we really can't be sure that the temperature hasn't actually decreased. And notice what he says: We are putting *more* carbon-dioxide into the atmosphere than expected, but the actual rise in temperature is *less* than expected based even on the lower emissions predicted by the models.

Mr. Lomborg also points out that rather than creating policy aimed at reducing carbon-dioxide emissions, we should create policy that focuses on economic development of poorer countries. After all, had the same typhoon that struck the Philippines last year, killing at least 21 people and displacing millions more, had been a hurricane that hit, say, Miami instead, there likely would have been no loss of life and personal and economic displacement would have been greatly minimized even if the property damaged by the storm was of greater value. We in the U.S. are better able to absorb the economic impact. You can read the entire article [here](#).

The State of Oregon should not be considering legislation that disadvantages its citizens against those of neighboring states. Since the U.S. Constitution precludes the State of Oregon, or any of the 50 states, from entering into agreements with other nation-states of the world and since any effort that will have any kind of positive impact on slowing rising temperatures (if such is deemed a bad thing) requires the committed cooperation of all nations of Earth, setting policy on allowable carbon-dioxide emissions within the state is not in the purview of the Oregon Legislative Assembly or the Executive. Again, I urge this committee to stop consideration of SB 324.

Davis I. Dyer
4888 Sea Gale Way N
Keizer, OR 97303-6368
(503) 393-0767
didyer@q.com