

February 10, 2020

Senate Committee on the Environment and Natural Resources

Chair Senator Michael Dembrow

Co-Chair Senator Alan Olsen

Oregon State Capital

Salem, OR

Senators:

This is to recommend the total rejection of Senate Bill 1530, referenced as Oregon's Cap and Trade Bill.

This bill is a fraud. This claim is easy to prove this because the bill is being sold to the public on a false premise that by enacting it, the anticipated reduction in human CO2 emissions will curb the claimed effects of "climate change". This is scientifically impossible. Oregon's share of CO2 emissions as stated by carbon accounting from the Oregon Global Warming Commission total approximately 68 million metric tons of CO2 per year. (68 MMT CO2) By the same measure, global human atmospheric CO2 emissions as cited by the IPCC, referenced here in 2017 were approximately 37 billion metric tons of CO2 per year. (37 BMT CO2) 37,077,404,000 metric tons of CO2 as cited by IPCC data per WIKI:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_carbon_dioxide_emissions

Simple arithmetic demonstrates by dividing Oregon's share of emissions into the global emissions total, $68 \times 10^6 \text{ MT CO}_2 / 37 \times 10^9 \text{ MT CO}_2 = .184\%$. The significance of this proves that Oregon's share of CO2 emissions, even if fully eliminated, which this bill cannot accomplish, would have NO MEASURABLE EFFECT ON FREE AIR ATMOSPHERIC CO2 LEVELS WHATSOEVER! If this bill cannot cause any reduction in atmospheric CO2, then any claim it can help curb "climate change" is a lie. There is no possible way to skirt around this truth and nothing further needs to be considered or discussed.

I would only add that as a degreed meteorologist in the Atmospheric Sciences from Oregon State University, that I have never in my life witnessed such terrible, untrue assertions and reckless distortions about the climate from those that have testified to this committee that the "effects of climate change are already ravaging Oregon". There is not a single part of any climate record or

Page 2

statistic in the record that proves this is true. EVERYTHING that is occurring at present or in the past remains within the established normal boundaries of climate and weather in Oregon. It is and always has been cyclic in nature with both warming and cooling periods.

This body has frequently cited reports from the IPCC about climate. This now politicized organization is full of contradictions but the truth can be found by examining all aspects of the reports:

There is insufficient evidence to claim hurricanes have increased:

We do not have enough data to say that hurricanes have increased.

“Confidence remains low for long-term (centennial) changes in tropical cyclone activity, after accounting for past changes in observing capabilities.”

pg 178 of https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_all_final.pdf

We do not have sufficient evidence that mid latitude storms have increased:

We do not have enough data to say that storms have increased.

“Confidence in large-scale trends in storminess or storminess proxies over the last century is low owing to inconsistencies between studies or lack of long-term data in some parts of the world (particularly in the SH). {2.6.4}”

pg 178 of https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_all_final.pdf

There is no evidence that floods have increased:

There is no evidence that floods have increased

“AR4 WGI Chapter 3 (Trenberth et al., 2007) did not assess changes in floods but AR4 WGII concluded that there was not a general global trend in the incidence of floods (Kundzewicz et al., 2007). SREX went further to suggest that there was low agreement and thus low confidence at the global scale regarding changes in the magnitude or frequency of floods or even the sign of changes.”

pg 230 of https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_all_final.pdf

There is no evidence that droughts have increased:

There is no evidence that droughts have increased

“Confidence is low for a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall) since the middle of the 20th century, owing to lack of direct observations, methodological uncertainties and geographical inconsistencies in the trends.”

pg 178 of https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_all_final.pdf

Meteorologists have known for a long time that claimed accurate prediction of the climate is not possible within the current state of atmospheric science. Climate models are nothing more than weather forecast models re-configured to do large time integrations, thereby sacrificing precision to maintain computational stability. They are overrated heaps of junk in the lay terminology:

Prediction of future climate is not possible.

“The climate system is a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.” https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/WGI_TAR_full_report.pdf (IPCC third Assessment Report (2001) Section 14.2.2.2, page 774)

NOTHING has happened in the Atmospheric Sciences since this 2001 report was made that has overcome the mathematical challenges that burden accurate prediction of the climate. What has changed is the blatant cover-up of failed model predictions of temperature that have cost taxpayers \$ billions of dollars. The climate record custodians of this data at both NASA GISS and NOAA have been complicit in this cover-up to protect reputations, government budgets and ultimately funding to the public universities who are protecting their grant money. This includes the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute at Oregon State University and Oregon State University itself:

<https://realclimatescience.com/2020/02/the-superbowl-of-data-tampering/>

It is a shame that institutions as these have become politicized to try and capture grant money selling climate hysteria, but this is precisely what has happened. Proof of this in Oregon is the fact that on March 10, 2019, 70 Oregon University professors endorsed a full page ad paid for by the political body the “Union of Concerned Scientists” that was printed in the Sunday Oregonian and proclaimed that passing HB 2020, which is identical to this bill, SB 1530, would curb the effects of climate change, which as explained above is impossible and a lie.

If the architects and drafters of this bill want it to become law, then three things need to happen. The dishonesty about this being a climate bill needs to stop. It would have no effect on the climate. Then it needs to be re-labeled what it actually is which is nothing more than an expensive energy sales tax. Finally, it should then be placed on a ballot and sent to Oregon citizens so they have an opportunity to vote on it, then determining its fate.

Page 4

To proceed any other way is as disingenuous as the bill is itself, hiding who is to receive money generated from it, attaching an unwarranted emergency clause to it and placing an enormous financial burden on individuals and businesses by significantly raising the cost of all forms of fuel and energy in this state.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chuck F Wiese
Meteorologist
Portland, Oregon