

February 22, 2019

Comment on HB 2020

I strongly object to this legislation on several levels. Before I begin I want you to know I am 4th generation Oregonian. I can trace 3 of my family lines back to the late 1800's in the Rogue Valley. I worked my way through Southern Oregon College, completed my degree, met my wife and was married all in 1969. I was drafted and spent 2 years in the Army where I was trained as a Surgical Technician and achieved the E5 grade in 13 months. I graduated from college with no debt. I spent most of 30 years working in the wood products industry where I started as construction and ended up managing mills. My wife and I had 2 boys and took in a niece which we raised. I have been very good at solving problems. I can look at a lot of factors and see outcomes. What I see here greatly troubles me! Here is what I see:

1. Some but not all scientists are concerned about CO₂ as a pollutant. The historical record shows that CO₂ is a lagging indicator for climate change and may or may not be reliable in predicting future climate. Also we may be entering a cooling period caused by changes in the sun's radiation. If that is the case and we enter a cooling period, what then?
2. My wife and I are both 72 years old and are not in good health. In the Northwest Pacific Planning Council plan 7 there is a statement that Oregon will be 500 Megawatts short of electrical generating capacity when the Boardman Coal plant is closed. Incidentally this plant has a planned life of another 20 years and is only being closed because of draconian emission control rules. In plan 7 they state that Demand Response is going to be a large part of how the grid deficiency will be met. I have been forced to have a Smart Meter in my house and I understand my power can be shut off remotely by PP&L for any reason. My wife is on Oxygen and has an oxygen concentrator and a Bi-Pap machine to help her with severe sleep apnea. She is also sensitive to heat and cold. If this plan works as Plan 7 discusses there is not enough power during peak periods and you will either shut off some people's power or go to demand load pricing. I can not pay double for electricity and or Natural Gas as we heat with gas. This could be fatal for my wife. How much more harmful could this be?
3. This plan will raise millions of dollars in tax revenue. I strongly object to using any of the generated revenue from HB 2020 to pay for PERS costs as I fear this is one of the main reasons this is being pushed. PERS is a mess and is the result of malfeasance on behalf of my government. I believe it is illegal as the legislature, judiciary and state administrators are all PERS recipients thus have conflicts of interest in deciding issues relating to this plan. I can not sue in the state of Oregon because the Judges have a conflict of interest. If this is about climate, the money raised from these taxes should only go to issues related to climate. One of the harms being caused is the Teachers who started this retirement plan now have to support the government employees and judges who can get full benefits after 5 years.
4. This bill will destroy any business in Oregon that uses energy of any kind. Other states that do not have these costs associated with energy will out compete Oregon business. I see this forcing Oregon business to close. The net result will be less tax revenue as there will be little productive business to tax. Also giving Intel a break might make political sense, but pollution is pollution and all should be equal in the harm this bill will cause. I do not want to see Intel harmed, but why should it be exempt if this issue is so pressing. I think the pressing issue is the legislature is rushing to push through all the legislation that fits their agenda quickly because people will feel this and be very upset. Thus the legislature is calling this an emergency thus

envoking the clause that keeps citizens from petitioning against it in referendum form. Citizens can still vote and I believe the harms this legislation will cause will make changes in how people feel about our government.

5. In the language for this legislation it is stated that a state agency will be formed and an administrator will be appointed by the Governor who will have complete administrative power on the area of Climate. This throws any legal action against the agency into administrative court. I strongly object to this action as it takes the people farther from being able to have input into how laws are made and enforced and is very far from what the people who founded Oregon would recognize.
6. This bill does not address forest fires, the biggest source of CO2 from the state. In Medford during the summer of 2018 we spent months cooped up in our house because the smoke was so thick that it was hard to see let alone breath. As previously stated my wife has several health issues and our Air Conditioning probably saved her life. I purchased extra stand alone air filters and changed our AC filter several times. The best filters I could buy cost \$20 and only lasted a week. I spent well over \$400 on filters and our AC ran continuously. I have seen estimates that electricity could double? One of my biggest objections is no one really knows the cost of electricity and natural gas. We are on fixed incomes and have some slack that we use for entertainment, but any substantial increase in utilities will be very hard on us. I am sure that water prices will go up as will sewer as they use electricity also. From my perspective this bill is very poorly thought through and has the potential to cause my family great harm. I think that as my legislators you have both a moral and fiduciary responsibility to re-examine this legislation and proceed carefully. I would refer you to France and what is happening there as the result of their Cap and Trade policy.

Sincerely,



Garl S. Grigsby
204 Sunrise Ave,
Medford, Or 97504