

Committee Members,

This bill is poorly constructed. The market and governance structure is not well defined. Any new market formation and major regulatory scheme of this extent should be structured in accordance with American principals of good governance and built through consensus and debate. In case legislators need reminding of principals to which I am referring: that means separation of powers between the executive, the judiciary, and legislative branches. The draft form for the bill exhibits none of these principals and is so devoid of content in this area that it cannot even be debated in a reasonable fashion.

I understand proponents of cap and trade to readily acknowledge that “full success” of the carbon reduction in the bill will not have a meaningful impact on climate change because Oregon’s contribution to worldwide GHG is too small- relatively speaking. Thus, I understand that support for the bill arises from a moral obligation that our small corner of the planet must take action and do our part for our small world.

I do not tend to think of laws that commit us to moral imperatives as being the kinds of laws that should not have much in the way of exceptions. Criminal laws, for example, have relatively few exceptions and they apply equally to all. As such, I do not understand the exceptions in the bill. Why are semiconductors exempted, for example. What is morally superior about Intel’s GHG emissions in Portland when compared with Bio-Mass One emissions in White City?

If this bill is a moral obligation for Oregon then that obligation should be borne by all Oregonians without exception and should be structured in a manner that separates the three branches of government in a manner that reflects good governance.

Jay Harland



President

CSA Planning Ltd.

4497 Brownridge, Suite 101

Medford, Oregon 97504

(541) 779-0569