

From 1992-2017, I was a seasonal park ranger at Crater Lake National Park in southern Oregon. Sadly I saw the negative impacts of climate change working there with a diminishing annual snowpack, the forest fire season getting more intense, and the winters becoming more mild. Thus, I became involved with Citizens' Climate Lobby (CCL) in 2012 and organizing for their bipartisan market based solution, carbon fee and dividend.

This carbon pricing solution called for taxing harmful fossil fuel pollution at the source (the coal mine, oil well, natural gas well, & energy imports at the U.S. border) and returning the money with monthly dividend checks given to each American household. These checks would actually be a net gain over the increased costs of pricing carbon for over 2/3rds of Americans, primarily low income and middle income households benefiting the most. Best of all it would unleash investors and entrepreneurs to go "all in" on the clean energy economy to help cut American fossil fuel pollution by almost 40% in 12 years and around 90% by 2050.

Since its founding in 2007, CCL has lobbied Congressional offices 10,374 times, which led to The Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act (H.R. 763) getting introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives in January 2019. Over the next two years, the number of cosponsors grew to 86 U.S. House members, including GOP Rep. Francis Rooney of Florida. 39 co-sponsors of the Green New Deal Resolution were also cosponsors of H.R. 763.

Advocates from CCL liked the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act because:

1. It's effective to reduce the threat of climate change by reducing America's emissions by at least 40% in the first 12 years. It's supported by economists and scientists as simple, comprehensive, and effective.
2. It's Good for people by improving health and save lives by reducing pollution that Americans breathe. Poor air quality causes an estimated 114,000 U.S. deaths each year and sickens thousands more. Additionally, the carbon dividend puts money directly into people's pockets every month to spend as they see fit, helping low and middle income Americans.
3. It's Good for the economy by creating 2.1 million new jobs, thanks to economic growth in local communities across America.
4. It's Bipartisan. Republicans and Democrats are both on board, cosponsoring this bill together. The majority of Americans support Congress taking action on climate change, including more than half of Republicans. Solving climate change is too urgent to get caught up in partisan politics.
5. Revenue neutral. The fees collected on carbon emissions will be allocated to all Americans to spend any way they choose. The government will not keep any of the fees collected, so the size of the government will not grow.

Last August, Columbia University economist Dr. Noah Kaufman published a paper in the science journal Nature Climate Change, A near-term to net zero alternative to the social cost of carbon for setting carbon prices. From this paper, his recent work on carbon pricing is called Near-Term to Net Zero (NT2NZ). This approach estimates the CO2 price needed in the near term to achieve net-zero emissions within a certain time frame. The good news, from a CCL perspective, is that the prices prescribed in the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act fall within the range needed to reach net zero emissions by 2050. "Net zero is really important. It's not just a slogan. At the global level, net zero is where warming stops," said Dr. Kaufman. Getting to net zero by 2050 requires a carbon price "in the ballpark of \$50 a ton in 2025 and \$100 a ton in 2030."

Thus, I hope the Senate Energy and Environment Committee will vote to support SJM 5 and I hope that the Oregon Senate will consider passing it.

Even more, I hope that the Senate Energy and Environment Committee will adopt the SJM 5-1 amendment to help this resolution gain the bipartisan support that it deserves.