

OUR VIEW

Brown supports a bad idea

Oregon Gov. Kate Brown last week threw her weight behind the effort to remove the dams on the lower Snake River.

We think removing the dams is a bad idea. While we don't question Brown's sincerity, we wonder why she's joined the fight when Oregon has no direct stake.

The dams in Southeast Washington generate electricity and allow farmers to move grain by barge down the Columbia River's main tributary.

Without the dams, the river would be too shallow to barge wheat and other farm goods the roughly 100 miles between Lewiston, Idaho, and the Tri-Cities. Lake Sacajawea, a reservoir created by Ice Harbor Dam, irrigates 47,000 acres. The loss of electricity generated by the dams would increase the cost of pumping groundwater.

Farmers are worried about being "at the mercy of railroads" and skeptical about switching to crops that use less water.

Certain environmental groups have been proposing for years that the dams be dismantled. Supporters say breaching the dams is necessary to save endangered salmon and other fish species in the Snake River Basin. They dispute the feared impacts on farmers and minimize the value of the energy produced by the dams.

Washington Gov. Jay Inslee, a Democrat, has long supported removing the dams. Most recently Inslee has touted removing the dams as a way to bolster the orca population in Puget Sound. Scientists blame a declining orca population on a lack of Chinook salmon for the killer whales to eat.

Gov. Brown has come late to the fray.

In her letter of support to Inslee, Brown said it is clear the "most certain and robust solution to Snake River salmon and steelhead recovery" is removing the dams. "No other action has the potential to improve overall survival two-to-three fold," she said.

Why now? We can only guess.

Brown, a Democrat, took office in 2015 when then-Gov. John Kitzhaber resigned. She won a special election in 2016 to fill Kitzhaber's unfinished term and was re-elected in 2018. Term limits prevent her from running again in 2022.

We have heard she has further ambitions, either in Congress or in a cabinet role.

What is better than supporting the breaching of dams in someone else's state? No matter what happens to the four dams in Washington, there's no direct political blowback on an Oregon politician. But that doesn't mean Brown can't burnish her bona fides with environmental groups that might be useful in future campaigns.

Now many of the people who support breaching the Snake River dams also support breaching the big dams on the lower Columbia. That would have big impacts on Oregonians. The governor has been silent on the issue. We are reminded of the old fable about the relative roles chickens and pigs play in producing a ham-and-egg breakfast. The pig gives his life, and thus is committed, while the chicken's involvement is free of risk.

Let's hope Brown never goes whole hog for dam removal.

STAR TRIBUNE
SBK

OTHER THAN THAT, MR. BLOOMBERG, HOW DID YOU ENJOY THE DEBATE?...



MY VOICE

The inconvenient truths of SB 1530

For those of us who are strong advocates for climate change reform in our state, the inconvenient truths surrounding the latest climate change legislation — Senate Bill 1530 — before the Oregon Legislature cause pause. From the beginning, the public has been kept in the dark on what happens to Oregon's statewide annual emissions numbers (at 64 million metric tons per year) when including the contribution our forests make to Oregon's carbon footprint.

In climate-change strategy, two key approaches exist — keep it in the ground (reduce the use of fossil fuels) and pull it from the sky (shore up mechanisms that pull out and store existing greenhouse gases in the atmosphere).

The state has singularly focused on the former (renewable energy, electric cars), while ignoring the latter. Both are needed. Here's why.

In 2017, the Oregon Global Warming Commission and, in 2019, the Oregon Department of Forestry independently confirmed that Oregon forests produce a net (after harvest) carbon sink of 30 million metric tons each year through annual tree growth. All other sectors in Oregon, including the energy and transportation sectors, generate approximately 64 million metric tons of emissions each year.

This means that when including our forests, the total net statewide carbon footprint is really at 34 million metric tons per year, not the 64 million metric tons quoted, resulting in an emissions level that is only 3 million tons per year short of meeting Oregon's 2035 statewide emission goals.

This good-news story has become an inconvenient truth to those pushing for passage of SB 1530, wishing to muzzle focus on this latest forest carbon discovery. Yet the exact opposite is needed. Of the 11 states in the U.S. that count forest carbon in their state's carbon footprint,

About the author

Catherine M. Mater of Corvallis is president of Mater Engineering and a former chair of the Oregon Global Warming Commission Forest

Carbon Task Force.

My Voice columns should be 500-700 words. Submissions should include a portrait-type photograph of the author. Authors also should include their full name, age, occupation and relevant organizational memberships. We edit submissions for brevity, grammar, taste and legal reasons. We reject those published elsewhere. Send columns to La Grande Observer, 1406 Fifth St., La Grande 97850, fax them to 541-963-7804 or email them to news@lagrandeobserver.com.

Oregon, Washington, California and North Carolina lead the nation in net forest carbon sinks. At 50%, Oregon leads the nation in forest carbon sinks that offset all other annual statewide carbon emissions. Washington and North Carolina forests each offset 30%, California forests offset 7%.

For Oregon not to take a lead in using forest carbon as a central tool in helping to reach ambitious future emissions reduction goals in partnership with renewable energy and fossil fuel replacement efforts seems irresponsible at best and dishonest at worst.

Another inconvenient truth rests with the unintended results of an 11th-hour compromise in SB 1530 that prohibits Oregon's private forestland owners from securing forest carbon offset payments through improved forest management practices, such as growing

carbon-absorbing trees longer before harvest occurs. Carbon emitters can invest in offset projects that equal up to 8% of their total carbon footprint. Other states with carbon taxes encourage forest carbon offset projects. Eighty-five percent of all carbon offset credits offered under California's carbon cap-and-trade program, which Oregon wants to emulate, come from IFM projects on private forestland, resulting in over 143 million metric tons of additional forest carbon sinks. Since 2016, over 3 million metric tons of forest carbon registered with the California program have come from Oregon private forestland. Almost \$40 million in offset payments went to Oregon forestland owners and their forest-based communities, helping to sustain and grow carbon stores and long-term wood supply. Yet SB 1530 supporters would muzzle that option for Oregon forestland owners.

Finally, while other states crafting carbon tax legislation are simultaneously proposing other tax-reduction trade-offs for emitters, Oregon legislators ignored this wise strategy by imposing another tax (20% on gross receipts) on the same companies targeted for carbon tax payments, creating a Marie Antoinette let-them-eat-cake scenario. If anything, legislators should provide an exemption from the new gross receipts tax for those in the forestry and forest products sectors in the state that contribute so much to Oregon's real reduced carbon footprint and to those heavy emitters who choose in-state IFM offset projects as part of their carbon tax offsets. As Antoinette discovered too late at the guillotine, the price of arrogance is severe and lasting.

Like many, I would like to see Oregon become the next state in the U.S. to pass a carbon tax, but not by masking the truth or at the expense of those who contribute the most to Oregon's unmasked carbon footprint picture.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

SUBSCRIBE AND SAVE
NEWSSTAND PRICE: \$1.50
You can save up to 34% off the single-copy price with home delivery.
Call 541-963-3161 to subscribe.

Subscription rates per month:
Union & Wallowa Co. \$11.80
By mail, all other U.S. \$15

THE OBSERVER

An independent newspaper founded in 1896
(USPS 299-260)

Periodicals postage paid at Pendleton, Oregon 97801. Published Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays (except Dec. 25) by EO Media Group, 1406 Fifth St., La Grande, OR 97850 (USPS 299-260)

COPYRIGHT © 2020 THE OBSERVER
The Observer retains ownership and copyright protection of all staff-prepared news copy, advertising copy, photos and news or ad illustrations. They may not be reproduced without explicit prior approval.

Phone: 541-963-3161

Toll free (Oregon): 1-800-781-3214
Fax: 541-963-7804
Email: news@lagrandeobserver.com
Website: www.lagrandeobserver.com
Street address: 1406 Fifth St., La Grande

POSTMASTER
Send address changes to:
The Observer, 1406 Fifth St., La Grande, OR 97850
Periodicals postage paid at Pendleton, Oregon 97801

STAFF

Publisher.....Karrine Brogotti	ClassifiedsDevi Mathson
Regional circulation directorKelli Craft	Home delivery advisor.....Amanda Fredrick
EditorPhil Wright	Customer service repMollie Lynch
News clerk.....Lisa Lester Kelly	Advertising representative.....Juli Bloodgood
Sports editor.....Ronald Bond	Advertising representative.....Amy Horn
Reporter.....Dick Mason	Graphic design supervisor.....Dorothy Kautz
Reporter.....Sabrina Thompson	Graphic designCheryl Christian
	IT supportNicole Gilbride

Chris Rush, Regional Publisher

