

**From:** [Maxson Sherman](#)  
**To:** [SENR Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** Cap and Trade thoughts  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 14, 2020 12:49:24 PM

---

I am writing again to express extreme concerns over Cap and Trade and the probability that it will be presented during the short session this year. I strongly urge you to work to prevent it from coming to a vote or if it does come before the floor to vote no on this bill for several reasons. This is a major piece of legislation that is very controversial. The short session was never intended for legislation this complex, controversial, and this far reaching. The rewrite is just now being presented, just a few short weeks before the session. This does not allow time for hearings or input from the people of Oregon. From what I understand, during a short session, hearings can be called with as little as one hour notification. This effectively excludes all but those along the I-5 corridor from Portland to Eugene. Your entire district along with over 80% of the entire state will not be given a chance to make their concerns heard. This alone warrants a no vote as it is grossly unfair because it excluded a majority of the state from participating in the process. In addition I am opposed to the emergency clause, a tactic that has been way over used simply to take options away from the public.

I am opposed to Cap and Trade for several reasons.

1. This bill is sold as a means to reduce carbon, however by admission of the authors it will do very little if anything to reduce global carbon. This is wrong
2. Authors admit that it will hurt jobs, particularly in rural Oregon, this attacks the livelihood of communities and industries. Offering funding for retraining in industries that are of little or no interest or dramatically alters the lifestyle of affected individuals again is wrong.
3. Even with the concessions to rural Oregon from the 2019 edition, when fully implemented it will have a far larger impact on rural communities than urban. It will have a far larger impact on low income families which are more prominent in rural communities. Oregon's 5 most populous counties have an average household income that is over \$25,000 more than lowest 15 rural counties. Higher fuel cost and energy cost hit low income and rural communities much harder. Many drive older less fuel efficient cars, must drive further for food supplies and services and have far less access to public transportation. Homes are often older and less energy efficient and many of our coldest regions of the state are rural areas. Disproportionately affecting one part of our population more so than another is wrong!
4. There is NO consensus on climate change, there are just as many studies that disprove the doom and gloom predictions as ones that predict the world is to end. Over the past 100 years there have been numerous times when the world was to end, we are still here and I strongly believe that the earth is a whole lot more resilient than many believe. Nearly all of us are concerned about man's impact on Mother Nature but decisions must be made on sound science not hype.
5. Even if Oregon was to reduce our carbon to ZERO the global affect would be inconsequential. Until policy puts pressure on China and India to make change anything Oregon goes will just hurt our economy. To force us down this path is wrong!
6. Repeated studies have shown that sequestering carbon and working with industries to

become more efficient will do far more to offset carbon than any Cap and Trade can do. We need to manage our forest, some might be set aside, but most need to be managed for maximum sequestration possible. This means harvesting and planting so that we have a constant supply of young actively growing forests. Policy need to be changed, especially in the management of our State and National forests. Vast acreages of dead, burned and diseased trees are left to stand. It should be obvious to all that these areas should be a priority to replant ASAP as a dead tree sequester no carbon. That alone could have a dramatic affect.

7. Agriculture must not be hamstrung by the crippling affect of Cap and Trade. We have a free market, entrepreneurship system that has led the world for more than a hundred years. It has encouraged efficiency in an industry that has dramatically reduced the amount of carbon per unit of production. In 1930 the average farmer fed himself and 4 others today he/she feeds over 160 and the number continues to grow. If we are going to provide food and fiber for a growing world population we must continue to allow Agriculture to continue to grow and develop more efficient production methods. By 2050 world Agricultural production needs to grow by 70%, the American farmer, if allowed to continue to be innovative and progressive, will lead this challenge while continuing to reduce the amount of carbon produced per pound of food and fiber produced. This is best accomplished through free market enterprise, not crippling regulations like Cap and Trade.

Max Sherman

[maxsonsherman@gmail.com](mailto:maxsonsherman@gmail.com)

503.999.3202

Hebo, OR

Sent from my iPad