

Testimony to the Joint Committee on Carbon Reduction on House Bill 2020 and the proposed establishment of a Joint Committee on Climate Action and an Oregon Climate Action Program.

.....

Dear Co-Chairs Senator Michael Dembrow and Representative Karin Power; Co-Vice Chairs Senator Cliff Bentz and Representative David Brock Smith; and Members Senators Lee Beyer, Fred Girod, Jeff Golden, Alan Olsen, Kathleen Taylor and, Representatives Daniel Bonham, Shelly Boshart Davis, Ken Helm, John Lively and Pam Marsh.

My name is Richard Wisner and I have lived in Lincoln County, Oregon my entire life. I am writing in opposition to this so-called Clean Energy & Jobs Bill, or Cap & Trade Plan, i.e., House Bill 2020. I apologize but due to time constraints in getting this to your meeting this letter will be brief and I have left out foot notes and references but everything is readily available on line. I write from the perspective of a sixty-eight year old, life-long Oregon resident and a product - so to speak - of Oregon's public school system.

Despite the 2007 Supreme Court decision *Massachusetts vs. EPA* (a five-to-four vote by-the-way) carbon is not a pollutant. Has everyone forgotten everything we learned about organic chemistry. Carbon, number six on the atomic scale is necessary for all life on the planet. And do you remember what diamonds are made of? Despite the fact that there is no empirical evidence that carbon dioxide is in fact raising the temperature of the atmosphere it has nonetheless become public enemy number one. During the long history of the theory of global warming, beginning with the Club of Rome we have seen a change not only from "global cooling" to "global warming" to "climate change" but also from *carbon dioxide* into just plain *carbon* and, more recently being referred to as *carbon equivalents*. What's going on here? Is "carbon" being turned into a commodity? Seems like it.

Despite what some climate models predict, (and I would like to remind the Committee that models are nice, but they are not reality) the IPCC's 5th Assessment Report rejects the popular catastrophic narrative. Specifically, the IPCC concludes that in the 21st century, Atlantic Ocean circulation collapse is "very unlikely," ice sheet breakup is "exceptionally unlikely," and the catastrophic release of from melting permafrost is "very unlikely."

Yet people are convinced that climate change is harming Oregon communities. But it is not harming Oregon communities. Actually, the increased carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere is helping to improve the state of the planet - and Oregon. For example, since 1950, fossil fuel consumption has

increased by about 550% and annual energy-related CO2 output has increased by 500% making atmospheric concentrations of CO2 increase by about one-third. There was no 350 ppm catastrophe and there will not be one. Do you know the ppm of the air in the International Space Station, or aboard one of our Navy submarines? About 5,000 ppm. No harm.

In that same time frame life expectancy has increased by 48% globally and since 2000, malaria and related deaths have decreased 62%.

Because increased atmospheric CO2 concentrations enable plants to grow faster and larger and use water more efficiently, crop yields, corn for example in the United States, has risen 25% since 2000, 44% since 1990, and 88% since 1980. Again, CO2 promotes life. Since 2000, the global percentage of undernourished people has declined from 15% to just below 11%. These are all improvements, not an apocalypse.

In the time frame mentioned above, per capita GDP has increased world-wide. Consequently, the percentage of the world peoples living in extreme poverty has declined 55% despite the increase in global population. Years of life lost due to disability and disease has also declined for all age categories, especially children.

Perhaps most importantly, trends in human well-being are improving - despite "climate change". Wealth creation and technological innovation make our societies better able to manage climate-related risks. The well-being of most of the planet's inhabitants are improving. As an example, since 1990, weather-related losses as a share of GDP have declined by about one-third.

It has been fossil fuels and innovation that has allowed humans to take a dangerous climate and make it safe to live in, not the other way around. Without the use of fossil fuels it is a guess what living might presently be like. Most of us want prosperity for Oregonians and the rest of the planet.

And do I need to remind the Committee just how much Oregon actually contributes to global carbon dioxide emissions? It has been shown that even if Oregon's carbon foot print was reduced to zero it would have about the same affect on the planet's climate, that is .... zero.

In a recent article by one of the Committee's Vice-Chairs, Representative Brock-Smith, he wrote of that infinitesimally small amount of CO2 Oregon contributes globally. In the article he mentions the following exchange that took place in committee:

When the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Director, Richard Whitman, was asked by me in committee what impact on global carbon would occur if Oregon were to reduce its' emissions to zero, he responded: "Rep. Brock Smith, you are correct that Oregon's portion of global carbon emissions is, I'll use the word minuscule."

When Dr. Philip Mote, Director of the Oregon Climate Services and Oregon Climate Change Research Institute, was asked by me what the impact would be on the global climate if Oregon were to reduce their emissions to zero, he responded the impact would be, "Imperceptible."

But, after decades of study and research by the brightest people on the planet the only solution the Oregon legislature can come up with is to stop using fossil fuels? What next then, after the green revolution, happiness will reign throughout the state?

But at what cost?

Sincerely,  
Richard Wisner  
Lincoln County, Oregon  
16 February 2019