

Attn: Members and Chair

HB2020 is bad legislation for Oregonians.

I was an attendee at the recent carbon reduction public hearing in Medford, OR, although I did not testify. What I heard from those in support of this bill was expected but still disheartening in its degree of [prevarication.by](#) supporters.

Testimony was made linking "climate change" to increased drought and storms. This is counter to the recent comments from the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change which has noted that there is not evidence linking drought or increased storm frequency/severity to climate change.

Several HB2020 supporters also referenced that gasoline prices decreased after passage of California Cap and Trade in 2012. The false implication is that the bill led to lower prices. They failed to mention an important relevant fact - 2012 oil prices were at a peak and as more production was coming on the price of gas dropped considerably in 2013 and 2014 across the nation (source: American Automobile Association).

Currently Oregon ranks 5th for highest gasoline prices in the nation. California ranks 1st - only 4 positions higher - yet, current average prices in California are 40 cents per gallon higher than Oregon. Cap and Trade resultant? Even if only 50% of this increase occurs in Oregon the impact will devastate producer ability to compete interstate and damage, in particular, Oregon citizens who are already struggling with high housing costs and making ends meet.

Laughably, many of the ultra-green HB2020 supporters accused those opposed to the bill of scare tactics. In psychology this is called projection. Many of the doomsday predictions made by the "green" proponents have not occurred and the extreme recent statements made mainly by one governmental agency uses 1 of several models currently under-consideration which is by far the worse scenario. This model is mostly rejected even by climate change proponents. However, what we have seen in California regarding economic impact is not a "projection" it is a harsh reality for millions of Californians suffering under the economic impact of this sort of legislation.

Finally, the carve outs for large energy users such as Intell belie the alleged purpose of the bill and especially its designation as "emergency" legislation. Also, there is no language sequestering funds raised to be used on environmental infrastructure. Instead, the 1/2 billion dollar estimated revenue generation will be subject to legislative and executive whim. If this is a back door attempt to bail out PERS it is a cynical ploy that ignores Oregon government's task to protect its citizens from fiduciary and other damage.

No on HB202.

R. G. Howell  
Jackson, County, OR