

**From:** [Bob Hart](#)  
**To:** [HRULES Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** HB 4167  
**Date:** Thursday, February 20, 2020 8:37:37 AM

---

## HB 4167 Cap and Trade

I am Robert Hart from Rogue River. I am a 73-year old land use consultant on the edge of retirement. I am writing to you in opposition to HB 4167 with three primary reasons.

I have no confidence that the full costs of this program can be calculated. The statement on the fiscal impacts of this bill on the State website is “May Have Fiscal Impact, But No Statement Yet Issued.” As for revenue impacts the statement is “May Have Revenue Impact, But No Statement Yet Issued.” From different stories in the news, this proposal could cost over \$500,000,000. A phrase from Jesus applies “Suppose one of you wants to build a tower. Won’t you first sit down and estimate the cost to see if you have enough money to complete it? For if you lay the foundation and are not able to finish it, everyone who sees it will ridicule you, saying, ‘This person began to build and wasn’t able to finish.’” Until we have a full cost analysis, this bill is not ready for any consideration because the cost must be part of the consideration.

I listened to the testimony before the Senate committee as public hearings and heard about the heroic efforts from farmers and others to reduce carbon emissions. Even without a bill as proposed, testimony was given from the rancher in eastern Oregon that has become so efficient with farm practices and solar facilities that he is completely energy independent. It is apparent that education of people about what can be done WITHOUT the massive increased costs of this program is the way to go. There was testimony about the Cap and Trade Program in California and how pilot programs have helped farms significantly reduce their carbon footprint. The example was about three farms in the central valley that have drastically improved their farming methods to eliminate impacts. However, the grants to fix just three farms were 90 million dollars. If that is what it takes to fix just three farms, there is not enough money available to fix our whole state as you propose. My conclusion is that using best management practices and education we can have a positive outcome to address climate change. This can be done now. With a massive program as proposed and the amount of monies prohibited from being reviewed, this is a recipe for disaster and bankruptcy.

My last reason to oppose this legislation is that this is such a significant policy decision, the decision should be left to the people of Oregon. This should be put to a vote of the people. I am appalled at the decision to place this legislation in the short session with an emergency clause. The original bill is 86 pages long and there have been 88 amendments proposed so far. With so many proposed amendments, it is obvious that the bill has not been properly reviewed and drafted so the merits of the proposal can be discussed in a rational manner. Seeing the process only reminds me of the saying that it is like trying to herd cats. It has been said that this bill is too complex for the people to make an informed decision. I say to you that this bill is too complex for the legislature to read and understand in such a short time frame to make such a monumental change to everyday life of all the citizens of Oregon .

I ask that you delay this bill until the full session is convened in order to have a cohesive bill that can be understood and that any bill go to a vote of the people.

Respectfully submitted  
Robert Hart  
Rogue River