

From: ott.irene@frontier.com [mailto:ott.irene@frontier.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 2:31 AM
To: Sen Edwards C; Sen Olsen; Sen Dembrow; Sen Prozanski; Sen Thomsen
Subject: Senate Bill 477 testimony

Senators:

As I review this and the many other "green energy" bills that are coming out of this legislative session, I am struck by the fact that there appears to be little thought being given to the real costs when renewable energy is prioritized above all other needs of the citizens of the state. It is being given more emphasis than our infrastructure, our schools, public safety, and the ability of the citizens to support their families.

While you may choose to say that bills such as SB 477 are not "taxes", they impact people the same way that taxes do. When you place requirements on the providers of necessities such as fuel and electricity that mean it will cost them more to provide their product, it is the customers who pay for those requirements.

SB 477 is a demand on energy providers that they replace a reliable, cheap energy source with unreliable, expensive sources of energy. While you will hear testimony from people saying how economical wind and solar generated electricity is becoming, you know as well as I do that it is not so. When the taxpayers are subsidizing the costs to generate the power, transmit the power, and having to assume the costs of back-up energy sources to address the fact that it is not baseload electricity, the failure to include those costs as part of the cost of the energy is misleading at best, and so far as I am concerned, it is an outright lie.

It seems that there is little thought given to the real social and environmental costs of the bills you are passing. When you pass bills such as SB 477 you are increasing the costs of a basic subsistence need of the people. When you increase the costs of subsistence items like gas and electricity, you place more people on welfare, more people require food stamps, more people have mental and physical issues related to the stress it places on family units and individuals.

How much thought has been given and what cost are you assigning to the fact that this bill will increase the need for natural gas? While I support the use of natural gas generation above wind and solar due to the fact that there are fewer environmental impacts, no energy generation is without costs. In the case of natural gas, the cost is in the large amount of water required for natural gas extraction. Depletion of the water resources of the planet will result in far more immediate negative consequences than whatever CO2 is being generated by coal.

I urge you to consider the real costs to the people you represent from the bills that have already passed through this committee. Ask yourselves if this bill is truly a need, or is it another one of the "wants" that seem to drive many of the bills passed to date.

Whether you call it a requirement, a program, a fee, a tax, a tax break, a subsidy, a grant, or a paperwork requirement, it is being paid for by taxpayers. If taxes are not being paid by one group, someone else is having to pay more than their fair share, when you require a business to take actions that increase their costs, someone is paying more for their product, if you give grants or no interest loans to a group, someone else is paying for them.

I encourage you to give careful consideration to how much your decisions are impacting the little people of this state, Please read the attached article that talks about the fact that California is having problems with too much green energy as the amount being generated increases. I question why Oregon would have a goal of following in the footsteps of a state such as California where the cost of living is so high that people are having to move out of state to survive.

Please see that this comment and attachment are included in the public record for SB 477. Thank you very much.

Irene Gilbert/2310 Adams Ave./La Grande, Or. 97850 phone: 541-963-8160