

House Committee on Energy and Environment &
Senate Committee on Environment & Natural Resources

Dear Chair Helm, Chair Dembrow, and members of the committees

I STRONGLY OPPOSE HB 4001 & SB 1507 – relating to greenhouse gas emissions

Placing a cap on greenhouse gas emissions by creating a market-based compliance mechanism buying and selling credits and levy fees on private corporations has nothing to do with cleaning up the environment. This bill attempts to identify CO₂ as a pollutant to reduce climate change and ocean acidification.

If the real purpose of this bill is to reduce pollutants affecting climate change and ocean acidification, as the bill states, then the bill should put its efforts into environmental pollutants that are harmful to our health and not CO₂, which the earth needs to reproduce.

Carbon taxes has been proven not to reduce emissions in the British Columbia experiment, and other places. This puts the whole motive for this bill into questions. Essentially this bill imposes a tax on corporations, which will ultimately be transferred to consumers in higher costs having a bigger impact on lower income families and businesses. This bill is a re-distribution of wealth simply for funding renewable resources and to create revenue.

The selling and buying of off-set credits allows offenders to escape state-forced closure by buying credits from opt-in entities that have excess credits. This control of our biggest corporations is a tyranny system of government. As with other revenues sources, the state starts to depend on that income, but unlike other sources, it is volatile to participation as California discovered last May when only 11% of available credits were sold yielding a loss to the state budget of \$490 million.

The significant increase in the size of government and corresponding regulations that goes beyond the subject of this bill is counter to helping Oregon's economy

recover. The background for climate change and CO2 as a pollutant is politically charged and filled with flawed science. This bill calls for best science, however, Oregon is incapable of not letting politics dictate the science. Oregon has one of the lowest carbon emissions in the nation already so where is the best science in this bill? The bill is a front for raising revenue by allowing the Environmental Quality Commission to create laws by rule based on this bill with unclear and vague objectives, technological constraints, lack of objective resources, unobtainable standards, and a lack of clear causal link between requirements. Goals are set to achieve unobtainable greenhouse gas levels at least 20% below 1990 levels by 2025, 45% by 2035 and 80% by 2050.

Rural Oregon will be hit the hardest when these fees and cost of credit are distributed to consumers, which will impact the operations in farming and forestry. These operations are dependent on motorized vehicles. Studies show that a 'one-size-fits-all' rule making process is swayed by litigious public interest groups that always work against what rural Oregon needs to be self-reliant.

Inhibiting free markets by manipulating profits according to carbon emissions is not how to attract business to our state. This is not in the best interest of Oregon so please vote NO.

Donna Bleiler