

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SENR Exhibits](#)
Subject: Concerns with LC 19
Date: Monday, January 13, 2020 6:45:01 PM

Dear Committee Members,

My name is Ellie Hilger, and I am a special education teacher living in Tillamook County with my husband, who is forester for a private timber company. We are expecting our first child in just 4 short weeks. We both come from logging families, and were born in Oregon. We absolutely love our life on the Oregon coast. There are many things that I am deeply concerned with in LC 19.

First of all, I was disturbed to hear that the natural resources industry was not invited to the Senate Interim Committee on Environmental and Natural Resources today, 1/13. I am hoping that is not true; for how can they not be a part of this conversation when they are such key players? How many jobs does the natural resources industry provide? All of these people are left unrepresented by excluding the industry from these talks.

Secondly, I am troubled to read that LC 19 includes provisions to assist workers who have been displaced or lost their job due to the cap-and-trade policy. With homelessness on the rise, I am confused why the legislature would be pushing any bill that would actually eliminate jobs. If the legislature chooses to go forward with a bill that displaces workers, then those workers need a very clear picture of the new jobs that the bill claims it will create. It is unjust to create a bill that displaces workers with no concrete plan on what the new "green" jobs will truly look like, and the impact it will have on the economy.

Thirdly, the proposed phase-in of fuels by geography seems to be an empty exemption for rural Oregon. Fuel distributors say that fuel costs will increase for all of Oregon families, regardless of where they live, and that the phase-in of fuels will eventually hit us all. DEQ and the legislators do not understand how fuels are imported and distributed, which will result in an increase in fuel costs for everyone.

Fourthly, it does not seem that legislators are protecting trade-exposed industries and working families from the negative impacts of cap-and-trade when the state plans to reduce protections and expose those industries to unnecessary cost increases in 2024.

Finally, I think that it is extremely unwise to push this bill through during the legislative short session. This is a very controversial bill that will effect so many hard working Oregonians. It is clear that we do not fully understand the impacts of this bill, so why are we pushing so hard for something in a short session? Let's wait until we can have a complete conversation with all of the players that are at stake in this, such as the natural resources industry. Pushing this through will only further the urban/rural divide that is threatening our state.

Instead of cap-and-trade, I am in favor of sequestering carbon and working with industries to become more efficient. We need to manage our forests for maximum sequestration. This means harvesting and replanting so that we have a constant supply of young, actively growing forests. Policy needs to be changed in our State and National Forests management. These policies would not only create jobs and industry, but also tackle the carbon issue. This is just one example of a different approach that Oregon could take in the face of climate change, an

approach that would not be detrimental to rural communities and natural resources industries.

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

Sincerely,

Ellie Hilger

Tillamook County, Oregon