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Introduction
A 25-member commission created in 2007 by the State, the Oregon Global Warming Commission is charged with helping coordinate statewide efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and guiding the state toward its climate goals. In 2007, Oregon adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals which include cutting greenhouse gases 10 percent below 1990 levels by 2020; and achieving a minimum 75 percent reduction from 1990 levels by 2050.

To lay out a statewide strategy for meeting these goals, the Commission developed an Interim Roadmap to 2020 in Spring 2011, with an associated set of recommendations for energy, materials management, industrial use, and transportation/land use. The Commission also authorized a “roadshow” initiative to communicate the draft recommendations to Oregonians, and elicit their reactions and comments.

This first – “Phase 1” – outreach strategy had ambitious goals with limited resources. With guidance from OGWC Chair Angus Duncan, assistance from PSU Graduate Intern Elizabeth Decker, and the diligence and creativity of a committed consulting team, the following were accomplished from April to June, 2011.

- **Five public workshops:** Bend, Medford, Eugene, Portland/Multnomah County (2) that engaged more than 125 participants.
- Eighty eight (88) completed detailed feedback forms on key roadmap themes, or propositions.
- More than 15 additional Roadmap presentations and discussions to State and local government elected officials, citizen boards and staff; legislators; University classes; and business, labor and faith organizations.
- Outreach to and through 40 listserves and associated organizations representing a broad cross-section of Oregon stakeholders and perspectives.
- More than 2,200 online survey responses.

Report organization
This document presents a summary of Phase 1 outreach activities. First, high-level survey results are presented followed by workshop comments and associated feedback forms. Appendices included detailed open-ended comments from the survey, workshop discussions and feedback forms.

Survey Results
The online survey was conducted using survey technology from Portland-based Fuse Insight Labs and survey design by Portland-based Mesh Strategic Partners in consultation with Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC and the OGWC Chair. The survey technology enabled the OGWC to replicate an interview experience with over 2,200 Oregonians from all over the state. This allowed the OGWC to gain insights about ways to approach climate change that resonate with Oregonians from a variety of geographic, political and ideological perspectives.
Each answer to a question creates a “pathway” down which related follow-on questions can be put in order to deeply understand the user’s point of view. In this survey, over 90 questions were designed. Respondents saw about 40 of them on average, depending on the “path” they chose. Respondents were asked each question one at a time, and then sent to the next question depending on their answer. Opportunities for open-ended responses were liberally afforded, and respondents took full advantage of these with over 3,000 written comments)

The results of this design on the respondents’ experience is significant: since they feel “listened to”, completion rates are two to three times higher than an average survey (a 68% completion rate in this case). The time respondents took to thoughtfully write responses was significant. The average completion time was 17 minutes.

In order to design a survey with this level of engagement, a review of other studies and topical literature informed the “pathways” that needed to have follow-up questions. The Climate Leadership Initiative and the Social Capital Project's, Climate Communications and Behavior Change report, which grouped voters into three major groups and 10 subgroups, ranging from “Green” to “Indifferent” to “Highly skeptical” was useful. Communications specialists Renee Lertzman, PhD and Leslie Carlson, Carlson Communications also provided important input about the sensitivity of climate-related communications.

Recruitment
This survey was deployed via newsletters, emails and traditional media with the help of more than 40 community partners representing a spectrum of business, labor, government and other advocacy groups. More than 20 groups in total brought in over 2,200 responses to this survey from all over the state. Each partner group was given a unique URL to share with their list, which allowed the OGWC to have visibility regarding the origin of the respondents without identifying individuals and their responses. Of the 2,200 respondents, over 1,400 provided their email addresses to the Commission and invited an ongoing dialogue.

The primary purpose of the workshops and online survey was to communicate Roadmap recommendations, invite responses, and open such a dialogue with what is hoped will be an expanding population of interested Oregonians. While the survey would strive for geographic, political, occupational and demographic diversity, the responding Oregonians should not be considered a statistically representative sample. The survey results need to be viewed with this caveat in mind. The upside of the chosen approach was inclusiveness. The downside was that respondents were more likely than the population as a whole to have strong feelings about climate issues, and more strongly favor or oppose State actions than would Oregonians as a whole. While future such Commission surveys will endeavor to develop a broader spectrum of respondents and opinions, it will continue to favor more participation over more statistically representative responses.

Survey Results -- Key Findings
Finding #1: Respondent’s behavioral attitudes toward climate change correlated with their political ideologies. Predictably, when viewed through a behavioral analysis, most self-
identified “Green” respondents were Liberal, most “Skeptical” respondents were conservative and most “Undecideds” were Moderates.

When viewed politically, Conservatives were highly skeptical of climate change in general, while most Liberals cared deeply about it. Moderates were divided but on balance acknowledged the reality of the issue.

While this finding confirms many existing stereotypes, it is very valuable because it enables us to view results in terms of both political and communications contexts. It may also allow us to identify areas where, climate beliefs aside, there are opportunities for citizens to agree on actions that serve more than just climate objectives.

Areas where there is strategic political alignment are also areas where strategic communications designed to inform and educate will be most effective.
Finding #2: Ideologies create separate realities.
Conservatives thought that nothing needed to be done to limit carbon in the atmosphere. Liberals felt strongly that something should be done. Moderates aligned decidedly more with acting on climate issues than doing nothing.

Even when respondents reported to have seen physical evidence of climate change over the last 15 to 20 years, they attributed this change to different factors based on their political perspectives. Conservatives in particular resisted the idea that human activities might be influencing climate change even as some of them acknowledged that such change might be occurring. Moderates' responses aligned more closely with Liberals, but likely with less conviction and commitment to a vigorous response.

On one hand, this finding confirms a stereotypical view of how politics and environmental outlooks relate – about how we may select and weigh opinions and evidence based on our political predispositions – but it
also is an important insight for us to consider as we develop a communications and messaging strategy that will build grassroots support for climate change initiatives. Communications about evidence may only affect a small subset of Moderates.

**Finding #3:** Several issues related to energy generation and conservation will enjoy the support of a majority of Oregonians, regardless of their environmental or political views.

A majority of Liberal and Conservative respondents who thought something should be done about carbon emissions believed that Oregon should focus on energy & utility issues to limit carbon emissions.

Even among those who don’t believe anything should be done about climate change, there was a strong value placed on domestically produced energy.
The preferred sources of domestic energy divided on political lines, but it is notable that coal was in the lowest percentile of choices for all groups; and among Conservatives, it was ranked with wind, methane and wave energy.

For those who believe that something should be done about carbon emissions, there was agreement on three priorities: renewables, smart grid and conservation.
When forced to select only one issue, respondents emphasized renewables and conservation, but dropped smart grid in lieu of coal energy reduction.

If you had to pick one energy or utility issue to begin with, what would it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce coal-based generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase renewable generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a smarter energy grid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighten emission standards for utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax carbon-based pollution sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase energy conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

["no action on climate warranted" respondents only]

Would you like more control over your monthly energy bill?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

["no action on climate warranted" respondents only]
Even the respondents who don’t believe anything should be done about climate change still indicate a strong interest in controlling personal energy costs among those, regardless of their political ideology (however, they may have very different ideas about what choices would best control their costs). This same group was very interested in efficiency projects that had a positive financial impact but quickly lost interest if financial incentives were removed.

![Chart showing willingness to do energy efficiency projects](chart.png)

"[no action on climate warranted" respondents only]

Many survey respondents elaborated on their preferences. Here are some comments on the choice between incentives and regulatory tools for reducing greenhouse gas emissions:

For those who favor incentives over regulation: “Incentives do less damage than regulations. I’ve seen too many poorly conceived regulations, like the MTBE debacle in CA. Or requiring ethanol in gasoline. People will do what is in their best interest. They hate being forced and will even work against it.”

For those who favor regulation over incentives: “30 years ago a mix of incentives and regulation would have been productive. We’ve waited too long to depend on incentives. What greater "public good" could be invested in than a human-friendly climate? None. See any rush to invest? We’re well beyond incentives.”

Among those who favor a mix of regulation and incentives: “Some things will just never change without regulations; that said, it would be nice to be as flexible as possible with industries, etc. who find this wholesale change extremely threatening and/or cost prohibitive -- change is very difficult, and the more you can get folks to make that decision on their own, the better.”

And here are two perspectives on the draft recommendation that Oregon replace its gas tax, on a revenue-neutral basis, with a tax that takes into account both miles traveled and the energy/carbon efficiency of the vehicle (and could apply to all travel, including by electric vehicle, bus and bicycle).

For those who think a substitute tax is a good idea: “People who use roads should pay for them - and yes, I believe that cyclists should be licensed, registered, and insured as part of the mix.”

For those who think a substitute tax is a bad idea: “Because it is a trick! It is no different then when a city asks its residents to lower their use of water, due to a shortage of reserve. The people oblige. The usage goes down, the "Bills" go down. There are not the funds to pay the employees that maintain the water systems, so the rates go up.”
Workshop Results/Key Findings

Workshop participants were supportive of the strategies in general and spent considerable time discussing the propositions [see the guide to propositions in the appendix]. It is important to note here that public workshops are generally attended by those who feel strongly about an issue. In these workshops, supporters of taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions predominated. The last two sessions, in Portland, drew a small but vocal (and clearly organized) representation of those who deny the evidence of climate change and the need to take action.

Volunteer facilitators were given a short discussion leader training based on best practices of communicating about climate change. A short summary of each workshop follows with the number of participants following the City name. Again, detailed comments are included in the appendix.

Medford (12) – This session attracted several elected and appointed officials from the Rogue Valley Council of Governments. Given the small (but high-caliber) turnout, participants stayed in one full group and mainly discussed tax implications in a question and answer format with Angus. As this discussion engaged elected and appointed leaders from the Rogue Valley Council of Governments, this will be a good precursor for future action associated with SB 1059 and related efforts. **Host:** Rogue Valley Council of Governments; **emcee** Vicki Guarino, RVCOG; City of Medford Councilor Al Densmore. **Date:** May 12, 2011.

Eugene (65) – This will attended session was promoted and organized by City of Eugene Sustainability and Climate Change staff, assisted by a graduate intern from the University of Oregon. Participants discussed six of the seven propositions. **Host:** City of Eugene. Co-hosts: University of Oregon, EWEB, City of Springfield; **emcee** Joshua Skov, Sustainability Commission Chair; Mayor Kitty Piercy; Councilor Alan Zelenka, City of Eugene. **Date:** May 26, 2011.

Bend (30) – After a Roadmap briefing for the Bend City Council briefing the prior evening (June 1), more than 30 participants engaged in three group discussions facilitated by local planning staff and volunteers. **Host:** City of Bend and Bend 2030; **emcee** City Council Member Jodie Barram, City of Bend; co-host City Council Member Mark Capell. **Date:** June 2, 2011.

Portland/Multnomah County (25) – The City of Portland and Multnomah County co-hosted this event with Mayor Sam Adams, County Commission Chair Jeff Cogen and Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder all in attendance. Participants discussed six of the seven proposition themes. **Host:** City of Portland/Multnomah County; **emcee** Sustainability Director Susan Anderson. **Date:** June 9, 2011.

Portland/Apollo Alliance (30) – This coalition of labor, business, environmental, and community leaders working to catalyze a clean energy revolution hosted a workshop that attracted 30 participants, including a small but organized group of participants who did not believe responding to climate change was an appropriate action. Other participants focused on meeting the state’s reduction targets. **Host:** Apollo Alliance. Co-hosts: Climate Solutions, Oregon Environmental Council; **emcee** Barbara Byrd, Apollo Alliance. **Date:** June 16, 2011.

Workshops - Key Themes by Proposition

Points mentioned by more than one group in more than one city follow. Complete summaries of the discussion are included in the appendix. Numeric results of feedback form comments follow the questions.
Detailed comments are included in the appendix. Participants could rank a recommendations as High Priority/Near Term (next 1 – 3 years), High Priority/Mid Term, or degrees of lower priority.

1. Embed Carbon in the Planning Process

Through careful planning, Oregon’s land use process enables us to manage growth while protecting the state’s natural values and livability. Can similar planning help us deal with greenhouse gas emissions and the likely effects of climate change?

Discussion recommendations mentioned by more than one group in more than once city:
- Update the land use planning process to focus on
  - 20 minute neighborhoods
  - Regional planning
  - School siting
  - Building codes
- Focus on transportation options
- Provide energy “scores” for homes/potential buyers

Feedback Forms:

1.1 How important is it that local community transportation and land use plans show how they are going to meet the State’s greenhouse gas (GHG) goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 How important to you is it that the state rewards communities whose transportation and land use plans meet the State’s greenhouse gas (GHG) goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Encourage but don’t require</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 How important is it that larger electric and gas utilities are required to help meet the state’s GHG goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Cities

Close to 70% of global greenhouse gas emissions come from our urban areas. By the same token, with their more compact form and efficient buildings and transportation systems, cities are where the greatest savings are possible. What are the best ways to capture these gains?

Discussion recommendations mentioned by more than one group in more than once city:
- Ensure safe transportation choice
- Increase bus/transit availability
- Encourage twenty-minute neighborhoods including grocery stores, safe routes for children, elderly to reach destinations
- Limit UGB expansion
- Connect pricing/SDC charges to the type and location of development

Feedback Forms:

2.1 Retain the Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) in Oregon's six largest urban areas as they now exist, focusing development and growth where they will support more efficient buildings and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage but don't require</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Keep the UGBs as they currently exist, while allowing exceptions for new industrial facilities adjacent.

Yes    No
34     67

3. Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Buildings

Half the buildings that will exist in 2050 have yet to be constructed. New structures can be designed to be energy and carbon efficient or even carbon neutral. Existing buildings can be retrofitted to realize energy savings.

Discussion recommendations mentioned by more than one group in more than once city:
- Include low income people; do not penalize or forget; make affordable to all including renters
- Provide better marketing of incentives for low income housing upgrades.
- Align work with architectural, urban design goals
- Require programmable thermostats
- Emphasize existing programs (Clean Energy Works, EWEB, etc.)

Feedback Forms:
3.1 How important is it that we amend building codes to require new buildings to increase energy and carbon efficiency by at least 50% by 2030?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage but don’t require</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Solar roofs are another way to reduce emissions. On a scale of 1-9, do you favor incentives or regulations to install them on all new buildings?

Average response: 7.7

3.3 Electricity and natural gas are available to heat homes and businesses in much of Oregon. How important is it that we require building owners to select the most carbon-efficient fuel if costs (equipment and operating) are about the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Shift Transportation Fuels

*Mobility is important to all Oregonians. Nearly 40% of total greenhouse gas emissions are related to transportation. How to preserve our transportation choices while decreasing vehicle emissions is the challenge.*

Discussion recommendations mentioned by more than one group in more than once city:
- Increase funding for electric vehicles, infrastructure
- Increase funding for renewable sources
- Focus on public education/outreach

*Feedback Forms:*

4.1 What percentage of the time do you use the following types of transportation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 If you wanted to leave your car at home more often, what would need to change?

- More frequent/convenient transit
- Safe walking/biking
- More park and ride
- Better urban design/20 minute neighborhoods
See also comment form results.

4.3 How important is it that Oregon encourages electric and similar alternative fuel vehicles with incentives such as tax credits for buyers and subsidies for recharging stations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hi 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage but don’t require</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Currently, our federal and state gas taxes support highway construction. How important is it that they also support public transit, and perhaps new inter-city high-speed rail service as well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>High 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 How important is it that the federal government requires a doubling in the fuel efficiency for new vehicles by 2020, and invests in new low-carbon vehicle technologies like electric vehicles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>High 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage but not req’d</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Ramp Down Coal Emissions, Ramp Up Efficiency, Renewables

Twenty-five percent of Oregon’s greenhouse gas emissions comes from conventional coal power plants; most of them deliver electricity into Oregon from out of state. Closing coal operations by 2020 at Oregon’s only in-state coal plant – PGE’s Boardman facility – will reduce coal’s contribution to Oregon’s greenhouse gas emissions by about 4% (to 21%)

Discussion recommendations mentioned by more than one group in more than once city:
- Invest in the grid, energy management
- Decentralize energy production
- Keep equity in mind

Feedback Forms:

5.1 How important is it that Oregon shift rapidly – e.g. by 2030 – away from conventional coal-generated electricity sources and toward more energy efficiency and both small and large scale renewable like wind and solar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>High 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Wind, solar and other new renewable technologies have higher up-front expenditures for capital costs, but lower fuel and operative costs over their lifetime. For many of these technologies, the higher front-end costs can be expected to drop over time, but there are no guarantees. On a scale of 1-5 (1 not willing; 5 very willing), how willing are you to pay somewhat higher power costs – possibly up to 10% higher – as a tradeoff to reduce carbon emissions?

Average response: **4.3**. Detailed comments in the appendix.

5.3 Many of these technologies will be more useful and cost less if we expand the high-voltage transmission system. This may raise issues with some households and communities or affect scenic or ecologically sensitive areas. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how much do you support expanding the transmission system, otherwise known as “the grid?”

Average response: **3.8**. Detailed comments in the appendix.

6. Capture Carbon Across the Board

*Greenhouse gas emissions also come from growing food, manufacturing consumer goods, packaging, and transporting these goods to consumers in Oregon.*

Discussion recommendations mentioned by more than one group in more than once city:
- Focus on food. Majority of GHG in production rather than transportation; decentralize/organic
- Label carbon content
- Focus on consumption rather than production
  
  “Harness economic self interest.”

*Feedback Forms:*

6.1 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you that the state requires calculation of the estimated carbon that results from producing, shipping, selling, using and disposing the goods we buy and labeling the carbon content?

Average response: **4.0**. Detailed comments in the appendix.

6.2 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 do not favor; 5 do favor), how much do you favor requiring the state to provide technical or financial assistance to industries that want to become more efficient?

Average response: **3.9**. Detailed comments in the appendix.

6.3 Forests and soils sequester carbon by capturing it and holding it in place. One way to do this is to leave trees to grow, especially in older, established forests. On farms, it may mean growing crops using practices that are less disruptive to the soil. What methods, if any, do you favor to increase carbon sequestration? (Check all that apply)
7. Embed Carbon in Energy Prices

It’s tough to talk about putting a price on carbon when we’re still emerging from a recession. What are your thoughts about taxing carbon as a substitute for other taxes, so that our energy costs and our taxes could stay the same or even go down if we produced less carbon?

Discussion recommendations mentioned by more than one group in more than once city:
- Emphasize carbon efficiency rather than energy efficiency
- Emphasize efficiency rather than congestion pricing.

Feedback Forms:

7.1 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you to replace the gasoline tax, on a revenue-neutral basis, with another approach whereby everyone pays for access to the transportation system, coupled with fees for the mils we drive and/or the fuel efficiency of our vehicles?

Average response: 3.7. Detailed comments in the appendix.

7.2 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you to replace the property tax, on a revenue neutral basis, with a revenue source based on the size and operating (energy and carbon) efficiency of each building?

Average response: 3.4. Detailed comments in the appendix.

7.3 Taxes or fees on carbon use, depending on how they are designed, could affect low-income households disproportionately. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you that such carbon pricing changes be accompanied by effective community programs to finance energy efficiency in the homes of low-income households, and improved access to public transit to provide affordable mobility to these households?

Average response: 4.4. Detailed comments in the appendix.

7.4 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 do not favor; 5 do favor), how much do you favor a national carbon tax or cap that would require everyone to share in the cost of reducing carbon emissions?

Average response: 4.2. Detailed comments in the appendix.
Summary and Findings:

Creating alignment among a variety of political points of view is never an easy proposition, and it is especially challenging when political interests have already defined an issue as with climate change.

Nevertheless, participants have shown us a common framework of interests that, if acted upon, can have real and meaningful impacts on Oregon's GHG emission policies. Respondents have also given us ideas about how we can communicate more effectively to Oregonians on issues of climate change without directly challenging their values and beliefs.

Preliminary findings include:

1. The Commission may have more success building and implementing an outreach strategy that focuses on the issues where alignment exists among majority of respondents regardless of their political or environmental point of view, namely: utility policies, energy generation and energy conservation.
   a. Currently energy is one of five topics upon which the OGWC is focusing; this issue could be more prominently positioned on the website and in other communications.
   b. Within the five areas, topics relating to utility policies, energy generation and energy conservation are referred to as “Energy and Buildings”. Change this to be more appealing to respondents’ personal interests surrounding reducing their energy bill, efficiency projects, building renewable generation capacity and decreasing coal dependency.
   c. Update the website to a more assertive educational stance. Ideally, this would create a matrix of opportunities and action steps that would help Oregonians quickly decide which projects fit their financial abilities and level of environmental interest.

2. A phase two survey can drill down to gain further insights into how Oregonians are interested in responding to the effects of climate change utilizing the results above. Test messaging can then be created for an updated OGWC outreach strategy. Gather suggestions for policies that will maintain our quality of life as climate change occurs. Unite the survey with in-person discussions in meetings and focus groups.

3. A statewide summit could be convened to discuss these policy issues, co-hosted by the Oregon Global Warming Commission and other state agencies, foundations and interest groups.

4. Follow-up should occur with all survey respondents regarding the findings of this survey in order to continue to build the community of Oregon climate change related efforts.

5. The Commission should follow-up with hosts in writing and personally – especially staff and elected officials.

6. The Commission may consider creating targeted outreach strategies for each group (Green, Undecided & Skeptics) and appeal to each in terms of actions that they are receptive to and that can lower their carbon footprint regardless of whether they believe in climate change or are skeptical of it.

7. The Commission can work with diverse political interest groups to help educate them regarding their constituents’ values within discreet political districts in order to promote a higher level of political discourse about climate change.
8. The Commission could meet with legislators, agency heads and local government leaders to discuss the Roadshow results, and with these leaders isolate on near- and mid-term action strategies including continued community outreach and engagement to build support for policy change.

**Appendices (under separate cover)**

A. Survey: Geographic Distribution (map)
B. Survey: Listserv Results by Organization (chart)
C. Stakeholder Organizations Participating in Survey (table)
D. Survey: Climate Communications Groups (table)
E. Survey: Respondents and Oregon political profile
F. Survey: Responses to Questions 1-90 (tables)
G. Workshops: PowerPoint Presentation (slideshow)
H. Workshops: Handout/Discussion Questions (insert)
I. Workshops: Feedback Form (11x17 handout)
J. Workshops: Discussion Results/Flipchart Notes (transcriptions by city)
K. Workshops: Feedback Form Results (results by workshop area)
L. Workshops: Discussion Leaders’ Guide
M. Workshops: Talking about Climate Change Primer [Not included here due to copyright issues]
N. Survey: Responses to Survey Open Ended Questions (word document)
Appendix A: Survey - Geographic Distribution*

Key: General attitude toward the topic of climate change among 2,231 Oregon respondents:

*respondents mapped by respondent-provided zip code.
Appendix B: Survey – Listserv Results by Organization (chart)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SID</th>
<th>Group name</th>
<th>website</th>
<th>Area of operations</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Contact person &amp; info</th>
<th>Who contacted</th>
<th>Survey info sent to them</th>
<th>Survey info shared by them</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000 Friends of Oregon</td>
<td><a href="http://www.friends.org">www.friends.org</a></td>
<td>Portland, state-wide</td>
<td>land use issues</td>
<td>Mary Kyle McKurdy, Policy Director, <a href="mailto:mkm@friends.org">mkm@friends.org</a>, 503-497-1000; Jason Miner, <a href="mailto:jason@friends.org">jason@friends.org</a></td>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td>5/9/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent survey &amp; workshop information to regional members. Posted on web and twitter. Very helpful partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIO</td>
<td>AFL-CIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>union</td>
<td>Barbara Byrd, Secretary Treasurer of the AFL CIO, 503-502-0601, <a href="mailto:barbara@oraflcio.org">barbara@oraflcio.org</a></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/10/2011</td>
<td>5/11/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent to Apollo Alliance contacts and AFL-CIO newsletter that goes to several thousand people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIO</td>
<td>Oregon Climate Change News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike McArthur, Director, <a href="mailto:mmcarthur@aocweb.org">mmcarthur@aocweb.org</a></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement went out to the listserve for the Portland workshops and included ACIO tag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSCME</td>
<td>AFSCME</td>
<td></td>
<td>public sector</td>
<td>worker union</td>
<td>AFSCME contact: <a href="mailto:rosalynggreene@yahoo.com">rosalynggreene@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>AD through Barbara Byrd</td>
<td>5/10/2011</td>
<td>5/13/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also sent to Association of Oregon Recyclers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>DLCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Weber, <a href="mailto:mary.a.weber@state.or.us">mary.a.weber@state.or.us</a>; Lisa Howard, <a href="mailto:lisa.howard@state.or.us">lisa.howard@state.or.us</a></td>
<td>AD, ED</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td>5/10/11 email</td>
<td></td>
<td>They emailed 200+ people on their list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Oregon Dept of Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Decker, <a href="mailto:doug.s.decker@state.or.us">doug.s.decker@state.or.us</a>; Dan Postrel, <a href="mailto:dan.postrel@state.or.us">dan.postrel@state.or.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Group name</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Area of operations</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Contact person &amp; info</td>
<td>Who contacted</td>
<td>Survey info sent to them</td>
<td>Survey info shared by them</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>Oregon APA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregonapa.org">www.oregonapa.org</a></td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>planning, professional development</td>
<td>Brian Campbell, President, <a href="mailto:president@oregonapa.org">president@oregonapa.org</a></td>
<td>KG</td>
<td>sent to KG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some Bend responses may accidentally be tagged with 'Medford' as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>Bend 2030</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>local sustainability plan</td>
<td>Jodie Barram, Chair, <a href="mailto:jbarram@ci.bend.or.us">jbarram@ci.bend.or.us</a>, 541-408-5099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Oregon State Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregonstatechamber.org">www.oregonstatechamber.org</a></td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>business</td>
<td>Sandra McDonough, Portland Business Alliance, <a href="mailto:smdonough@portlandalliance.com">smdonough@portlandalliance.com</a></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/3/11 to PBA, later to Oregon Chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Citizens Cabinet</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>public engagement</td>
<td>Wendy Willis, Director with The Policy Consensus Initiative, <a href="mailto:wwillis@pdx.edu">wwillis@pdx.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No go; Cabinet will be organized later in the summer and would need to reformat the survey to meet their standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csol</td>
<td>Climate Solutions/ 1 Sky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Adatto, <a href="mailto:lisa@climatesolutions.org">lisa@climatesolutions.org</a>; Jamie Hogue, <a href="mailto:jamie@climatesolutions.org">jamie@climatesolutions.org</a></td>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jana emailed them also on 5/6/11. No responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctru</td>
<td>The Climate Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanna Brownstein, <a href="mailto:sbrownstein@climatetrust.org">sbrownstein@climatetrust.org</a>, 503-238-1915</td>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No responses, although initially interested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHM</td>
<td>Adam Davis’ list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Davis, who pointed to Jenny Allison, <a href="mailto:jallison@dhmresearch.com">jallison@dhmresearch.com</a></td>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>Email sent to 200+ Oregon members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Dennett, <a href="mailto:Chris.Dennett@regence.com">Chris.Dennett@regence.com</a>, 503-525-6516</td>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td>5/10/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Email sent to 200+ Oregon members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Earl Blumenauer’s campaign list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hillary Barbour, <a href="mailto:hillary.barbour@mail.house.gov">hillary.barbour@mail.house.gov</a>, 503-231-2004</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/17/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't hear back; no responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Stakeholder Organizations Participating in Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SID</th>
<th>Group name</th>
<th>website</th>
<th>Area of operations</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Contact person &amp; info</th>
<th>Who contacted</th>
<th>Survey info sent to them</th>
<th>Survey info shared by them</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMO</td>
<td>Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon</td>
<td><a href="http://www.emoregon.org">www.emoregon.org</a></td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>faith, environment, social issues</td>
<td>Carla Starrett-Bigg, Director of Development and Communications, <a href="mailto:csbigg@emoregon.org">csbigg@emoregon.org</a>; Jenny Holmes, Director, <a href="mailto:inec@emoregon.org">inec@emoregon.org</a> or <a href="mailto:jholmes@emoregon.org">jholmes@emoregon.org</a>, 503-221-1054 ext 214</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Was sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>City of Eugene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Babe O'Sullivan, <a href="mailto:Babe.OSullivan@ci.eugene.or">Babe.OSullivan@ci.eugene.or</a>. us</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also sent to Patricia in Babe's office to distribute at UO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOC</td>
<td>OGWC website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.keeporegoncool.org">www.keeporegoncool.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angus' website contact</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Published on OGWC website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOC</td>
<td>Register-Guard article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/24/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>League of Oregon Cities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.orcities.org">www.orcities.org</a></td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>local government</td>
<td>Mike McCauley, <a href="mailto:mmccauley@orcities.org">mmccauley@orcities.org</a></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/2/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Was sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bend 2030 / City of Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Press release with wrong SID tag got sent out; some confusion between Bend and Medford responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Rogue Valley Council of Governments</td>
<td>rvcog.org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emailing survey link with workshop announcement; posting survey link to webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEEC</td>
<td>Northwest Energy Efficiency Council (NEEC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRDC</td>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Group name</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>Area of operations</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Contact person &amp; info</td>
<td>Who contacted</td>
<td>Survey info sent to them</td>
<td>Survey info shared by them</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBA</td>
<td>Oregon Business Association (OBA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oba-online.org">www.oba-online.org</a></td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>business</td>
<td>Kelly O'Brien, Director of Public Affairs, <a href="mailto:kelly@oba-online.org">kelly@oba-online.org</a>; Ryan Deckert</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Believe they sent it out in their newsletter but not confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCPP</td>
<td>Oregon Center for Public Policy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ocpp.org">www.ocpp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Mercer, <a href="mailto:lmercer@ocpp.org">lmercer@ocpp.org</a></td>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td>5/9/11 newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOE</td>
<td>Oregon Dept of Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portland office, statewide membership main work in Salem</td>
<td>environmental issues</td>
<td>Bill Drumheller, 503-378-4035, <a href="mailto:bill.drumheller@odoe.state.or.us">bill.drumheller@odoe.state.or.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEC</td>
<td>Oregon Environmental Council (OEC)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oeconline.org">www.oeconline.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>environmental issues</td>
<td>Andrea Durbin, Director: 503-222-1963 x104, <a href="mailto:AndreaD@oeconline.org">AndreaD@oeconline.org</a> Jana: 360-618-2722 cell, <a href="mailto:JanaG@oeconline.org">JanaG@oeconline.org</a></td>
<td>ED, AD</td>
<td>5/3/2011</td>
<td>5/4/11, 5/13/11 in newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jana was extremely helpful and a strong partner. Helped spread workshop info also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCV</td>
<td>Oregon League of Conservation Voters (OLCV)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.olcv.org">www.olcv.org</a></td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>environmental issues</td>
<td>Ben DuPree, Communications Director, <a href="mailto:ben@olcv.org">ben@olcv.org</a>; Meredith Shield, Director, <a href="mailto:meredith@olcv.org">meredith@olcv.org</a>, 971-221-3201;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent it, must have used OEC SID or other generic tag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONOR</td>
<td>The Bus Project</td>
<td><a href="http://www.busproject.org">www.busproject.org</a></td>
<td>Portland, state-wide</td>
<td>political advocacy, youth involvement</td>
<td>Scott Duncomb 503-233-3018, <a href="mailto:scott@busproject.org">scott@busproject.org</a></td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>5/17/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott was very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONOR</td>
<td>Onward Oregon</td>
<td><a href="http://www.onwardoregon.org">www.onwardoregon.org</a></td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>environmental justice, minority issues</td>
<td>Scott Duncomb 503-233-3018, <a href="mailto:scott@busproject.org">scott@busproject.org</a></td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>5/17/2011</td>
<td>6/1/11 sent out newsletter about the workshop.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide online advocacy list; loosely affiliated with The Bus. Sent out info about workshops but was too late with survey info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPAL</td>
<td>OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon</td>
<td><a href="http://www.opalpdx.org/">http://www.opalpdx.org/</a></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jon Ostar, <a href="mailto:jon@opalpdx.org">jon@opalpdx.org</a></td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>5/17/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Stakeholder Organizations Participating in Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SID</th>
<th>Group name</th>
<th>Area of operations</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Contact person &amp; info</th>
<th>Who contacted</th>
<th>Survey info sent to them</th>
<th>Survey info shared by them</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDX</td>
<td>City of Portland/Multnomah County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Ocken, City of Portland, <a href="mailto:Julie.Ocken@portlandoregon.gov">Julie.Ocken@portlandoregon.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/17/2011, also 6/14/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Originally sent as part of press release for workshop; also sent out by Mayor’s email and in City’s e-newsletter in mid-June to 4,000 people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNP</td>
<td>Renewable Northwest Project (RNP)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rnp.org">www.rnp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Shimshak, Ex Dir, 503.223.4544 (w), <a href="mailto:Rachel@RNP.org">Rachel@RNP.org</a>; Erin Greeson, Communications Manager, <a href="mailto:erin@rnp.org">erin@rnp.org</a>, 503-223-4544; Caitlin Peel, <a href="mailto:caitlin@rnp.org">caitlin@rnp.org</a></td>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td>5/9/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIU</td>
<td>SEIU/Teamsters/Hotel Workers</td>
<td>service work union</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Novick: <a href="mailto:stevenovick96@gmail.com">stevenovick96@gmail.com</a>, 503-516-0624; Heather Conroy, OSEIU <a href="mailto:conroyh@opeuseiu.org">conroyh@opeuseiu.org</a></td>
<td>AD through Novick and Barbara Byrd</td>
<td>5/10/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>No responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Bransford, <a href="mailto:Philip_Bransford@co.washingt">Philip_Bransford@co.washingt</a> on.or.us</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/17/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent to multiple environmental groups to tweet to their members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy Smith, <a href="mailto:cindy.s.smith@wrd.state.or.us">cindy.s.smith@wrd.state.or.us</a>; Brandi Elmer, <a href="mailto:brandi.elmer@wrd.state.or.us">brandi.elmer@wrd.state.or.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td>5/9/2011</td>
<td>Some problems with the link formatting as sent; may have discouraged responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRD</td>
<td>Oregon Water Resources Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Stakeholder Organizations Participating in Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SID</th>
<th>Group name</th>
<th>website</th>
<th>Area of operations</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Contact person &amp; info</th>
<th>Who contacted</th>
<th>Survey info sent to them</th>
<th>Survey info shared by them</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro OptIn panel</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregonmetro.gov/coconnect">www.oregonmetro.gov/coconnect</a></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>public engagement</td>
<td>Kim Ellis, Dylan Rivera <a href="mailto:dylan.rivera@oregonmetro.gov">dylan.rivera@oregonmetro.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't work out; wanted to reformat the survey to meet their standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ULI Oregon</td>
<td><a href="http://oregon.uli.org/">http://oregon.uli.org/</a></td>
<td>statewide, Portland focus</td>
<td>land use issues</td>
<td>ask Kirstin</td>
<td>KG</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in info sent for April event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D: Climate Communications Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
<th>Aggregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Green-hued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenest Americans</td>
<td>believes that everything is connected, and our daily actions have an impact on the environment</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealists</td>
<td>Green lifestyles are part of a new way of being</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Traditionalists</td>
<td>Healthy families need a healthy environment</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Undecided</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalists</td>
<td>Religion and morality dictate actions in a world where humans are superior to nature</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driven Independents</td>
<td>Protecting the earth is fine as long as it doesn’t get in the way of success</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murky Middles</td>
<td>Indifferent to most everything, including the environment</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Skeptics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatalists</td>
<td>Getting material and status needs met on a daily basis trumps worries about the planet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materialists</td>
<td>Little can be done to protect the environment, so why not get a piece of the pie</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruel Worlders</td>
<td>Resentment and isolation leave no room for environmental concerns</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UnGreens</td>
<td>Environmental degradation and pollution are inevitable parts of America’s prosperity</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Survey – Respondents and Oregon Political Profile

According to a Gallup Study released in February 2011, Oregon’s political demographics are:

- 26% Liberal
- 35% Moderate
- 34% Conservative

See the chart below for comparisons to survey respondents.

The process definitely over-sampled Liberals, but with responses from 450 Conservative and 473 Moderate respondents, this gives us about 2x the sample size needed for a statistically valid analysis.
Appendix F: Survey – Responses to Questions 1 - 90

Respondent Characteristics:

Age Range:

Respondents to the survey followed a bell-shaped distribution of age, with about 1/3 in the 36 to 55 age range, about 1/3 in the 56-65 range and the others evenly divided fairly evenly in the younger and older demographic groups.

Occupations:

About 70% of respondents were employed at least part-time and about 22% retired and the remainders were caretakers, students or unemployed.

Political Outlook:

Only about 54% of respondents identified strongly with any political party, but the majority felt comfortable describing their general political outlook. About 60% were somewhat or very liberal, 20% were moderate and 20% were somewhat or very conservative.
Location:

About 60% of the respondents were from the Portland/Metro area. Other respondents were from the Central Willamette Valley (14%), Central Oregon (9%), Southern Oregon (8%) Eastern Oregon (5%) and the Coast (3%). A larger version of this map is available in Appendix A.

All Responses:

Please be aware of 4 things as you review these results:

1. Question numbers will skip when open-ended follow-up questions are asked.
2. The number of respondents (indicated below the question with the “n=” will change as respondents choose certain answers
3. Red-colored graphs indicate that the respondent could have selected more than one answer, green-colored graphs indicate just one possible response.
4. In many cases, “other” was a response that could be filled in; these answers are captured in Appendix B.

Project: OGWC_Roadmap_3_3_2011 Oregon Global Warming Commission Public Outreach

2  This may be hard to answer in the middle of a wet spring, but generally speaking, how do you feel about Oregon's weather?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I love it all!</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I endure weather in some seasons and love it</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to live elsewhere sometimes</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hate Oregon weather!</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 2271
As you know, Oregon's weather may change dramatically many times a day. Changes in Oregon's climate (or long-term weather) take place more slowly and less dramatically.

Over the last 15 to 20 years, have you seen any changes in Oregon's climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some changes</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 2271

What do you attribute this change in climate to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human activity</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturally occurring weather patterns</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More carbon in the atmosphere</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population impact</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1184

How would you describe your relationship to Oregon's environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avid outdoors person in any type of weather</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy getting outside when the weather cooperates</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love it, but don't get out in nature very often</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really very &quot;outdoorsy&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 2271
### What indoor activities do you do regularly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies/crafts</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 229*

### What outdoor activities do you do regularly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/walking</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowsports</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 2026*
Check any of the following that have affected your outdoor activities:

(...or click "Next" to skip)

- Hotter summers: 450 (22%)
- More intense forest fires: 326 (16%)
- Less snow in the mountains: 347 (17%)
- Increased flooding: 228 (11%)
- Coastal land erosion: 129 (6%)
- None of the above: 976 (48%)

n = 2026

When you hear people talking about global warming, greenhouse gases, carbon reduction and climate change, which of the following most accurately describes how you feel?

- I don't care: 48 (2%)
- I'm skeptical about it: 532 (23%)
- Don't know/not sure: 47 (2%)
- It's probably happening: 338 (15%)
- I care deeply: 1301 (57%)

n = 2266
You probably remember the carbon cycle graphic to the right from grade school.

Scientists are concerned that this carbon cycle is becoming out of balance due to human activity (burning coal, oil, gas, etc.) as it sends carbon particles into the atmosphere.

Most scientists believe this will change the earth’s climate in ways that can prove difficult for human life.

Do you think anything should be done to limit the amount of carbon being released into the atmosphere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably so</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 2271

Based on the answers to this question, the respondents were taken down two separate paths:

- Those who answered “Definitely not, Probably not or Don’t know/not sure” were sent to questions #31 to #57;
- Those who answered “Probably so” or “Yes, definitely answered questions #18 to #29.
Carbon is released from several sources (see graphic to the right).

These sources are associated with activities that have benefits to humanity (food, shelter, heat, jobs...), making the reduction of carbon emissions a difficult task.

What do you think Oregon should focus on to limit the amount of carbon that is released?

(Please be sure to select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy/utilities</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings' efficiency</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 1728 \]
If you could direct Oregon’s elected leaders and scientists to focus on one source of carbon emission, what would you start?

(Select one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy/utilities</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/waste management</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Land use</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1728

Which agricultural issues do you think should be focused on in Oregon?

(select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase fertilizer efficiency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage farming practices that keep carbon in plants and the soil</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane (manure) -based energy generation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve efficiencies in irrigation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 48
Which waste management issues should be focused on in Oregon? (select all that apply)

- Consumer carbon content labeling: 24 (42%)
- Reducing food waste: 34 (60%)
- Adding into Oregon’s carbon inventory the emissions caused by goods produced elsewhere: 35 (61%)

n = 57

Which industrial issues should be focused on in Oregon? (select all that apply)

- Tightening emissions standards: 165 (84%)
- Assisting improvements in industrial efficiencies: 150 (77%)
- Product labeling: 65 (33%)
- Improving freight transportation efficiency: 139 (71%)

n = 196

Which forestry issues do you think should be focused on in Oregon? (select all that apply)

- Develop forest carbon inventory/tracking tools: 30 (67%)
- Leave west-side (moist) forests alone to accumulate carbon: 35 (78%)
- Manage and reduce fuel loading in east-side (dry) forests: 23 (51%)
- Rely primarily on private forest holdings for wood products: 22 (49%)
- No net conversion of forest to non-forest uses (e.g., resort developments): 34 (76%)

n = 45
### Question 25

**Which energy or utility issues should be focused on in Oregon? (select all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce coal-based generation</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase renewable generation</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a smarter energy grid</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighten emission standards for utilities</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax carbon-based pollution sources</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase energy conservation</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total respondents (n) = 698*

### Question 26

**If you had to pick one energy or utility issue to begin with, what would it be?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce coal-based generation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase renewable generation</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a smarter energy grid</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighten emission standards for utilities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax carbon-based pollution sources</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase energy conservation</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total respondents (n) = 698*
**Which transportation issues should be focused on in Oregon?**  
(select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban and intercity public transit</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and residential districts that require less driving</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight vehicles and infrastructure with lower carbon emissions</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon fuel standards</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embed climate change in transportation planning</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize carbon efficiency in transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher taxes on carbon-based vehicle fuels</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric &amp; alternative vehicles</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 514*

---

**If you had to pick one transportation or land use issue to begin with, what would it be?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban and intercity public transit</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and residential districts that require less driving</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight vehicles and infrastructure with lower carbon emissions</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon fuel standards</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embed climate change in transportation planning</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize carbon efficiency in transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher taxes on carbon-based vehicle fuels</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric &amp; alternative vehicles</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 514*
31 Do you think Oregon should strive to obtain more of its energy from domestic (American) sources?

- Definitely not! 15 3%
- Probably not 21 4%
- Don't know/not sure 24 4%
- Probably 104 19%
- Yes, absolutely! 379 70%

n = 543

33 Would you be willing to do some energy efficiency projects in your house if it meant you would save energy, lower your utility bills, and maybe pay lower taxes?

- Yes, absolutely! 166 31%
- Probably 218 40%
- Don't know/not sure 69 13%
- Probably not 54 10%
- Definitely not! 36 7%

n = 543

34 Would you be willing to do so if it would cost you a little more each month – say $5 – but would lower carbon emissions?

- Yes 38 10%
- Maybe/not sure 103 27%
- No 243 63%

n = 384
Good roads are expensive to maintain. Currently a gas tax pays for roads, but with more efficient cars, this funding is decreasing. Do you think drivers should pay for roads based on a formula that includes the number of miles they actually drive and how fuel-efficient their car is?

Yes, absolutely! 29 5%
Probably 54 10%
Don’t know/not sure 54 10%
Probably not 88 16%
Definitely not! 318 59%

n = 543

Should we make it a priority in this state to have an energy- and carbon-efficient transportation infrastructure (roads, railways and airports)?

Yes, absolutely! 29 5%
Probably 72 13%
Don’t know/not sure 88 16%
Probably not 155 29%
Definitely not! 199 37%

n = 543

What changes, if any, would you support to make the transportation system more carbon efficient?

Free public transit 18 18%
More bicycle lanes 26 26%
Preferential parking for electric vehicles 10 10%
Dedicated freeway lanes for cars with two or more passengers 37 37%
Dedicated freeway lanes for electric or hybrid cars 7 7%
Taxing miles driven in less efficient vehicles 13 13%
None of the above 36 36%

n = 101
### Question 40
Do you think protecting farmland from development should continue to be a land use priority in Oregon?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 543*

### Question 42
If utilities would write you a check for the energy you produce, would you want to make renewable energy improvements to your residence? (examples include installing solar panels or wind turbines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 543*

### Question 43
Would you invest in these types of home improvements even if the utility payments didn’t cover all your costs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 199*
44 Would you like more control over your monthly energy bill?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 543

One idea for giving you more control over your monthly energy bill is to base your property tax not on its market value, but on your home energy usage.

45 Doing energy efficiency projects under this proposal would effectively decrease your taxes (and your energy costs).

What do you think about this idea?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad idea</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would take a lot to sell me on this idea</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting idea, worth exploring</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great idea - do it now!</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 395

46 Are transportation costs a concern to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually not</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 543
**47** Would you purchase a natural gas-fueled vehicle if it enabled you to have a significant cost savings?

- Yes, absolutely! 75 17%
- Probably 118 26%
- Don’t know/not sure 128 29%
- Probably not 78 17%
- Definitely not! 48 11%

*n = 447*

**48** Would you still want to purchase this type of vehicle if it cost 10% more?

- Definitely not! 41 21%
- Probably not 65 34%
- Don’t know/not sure 38 20%
- Probably 43 22%
- Yes, absolutely! 6 3%

*n = 193*

**49** Would you be willing to pay a little bit more for an electric vehicle if it meant that you never had to pay for gas again?

- Yes, absolutely! 14 3%
- Probably 51 11%
- Don’t know/not sure 85 19%
- Probably not 125 28%
- Definitely not! 172 38%

*n = 447*
Would you be willing to pay more for an electric vehicle that cost you less to drive but more to buy, say 20% more upfront than buying a conventional gasoline-powered car?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Don't know/not sure</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>No, definitely not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't know/not sure</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably not</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No, definitely not</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n = 64\]

Would you be willing to pay more for gas if it was ethanol-based fuel produced from Oregon farms?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes, absolutely!</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Don't know/not sure</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, absolutely!</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't know/not sure</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably not</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitely not!</strong></td>
<td>392</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n = 543\]

Would you invest in a solar, wind or other renewable energy generation facility if you knew that you could make an above-market return on your investment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes, absolutely!</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Don't know/not sure</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, absolutely!</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably</strong></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't know/not sure</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably not</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitely not!</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n = 543\]
**53** Would you invest in this type of renewable energy generation facility for your home or business if you knew that it might cost you more than buying conventional electricity from your utility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 264*

**55** Is it important to you to purchase locally grown produce?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely!</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not!</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 543*

**57** In your opinion, what is the worst-case scenario that could evolve if rules about climate change and reducing carbon emissions go into effect in Oregon?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More rules, regulations &amp; government control</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher cost of living</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer natural resource-based jobs</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer outdoor activities</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts limits on my driving</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative health effects</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 543*
**58** If you could choose any source to get your energy from, what would it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydroelectric</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane (from sewage)</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo-thermal</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave (ocean-based)</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 2271*

**76** Generally speaking, how do you think government should approach dealing with climate change?

- **Incentives-based** approach - encourage adoption of practices with positive reinforcement
  - Count: 294, Percentage: 13%

- **Regulations-based** approach - set standards and require meeting them with enforcement
  - Count: 104, Percentage: 5%

- **Both** Incentives and Regulations
  - Count: 1445, Percentage: 64%

- **Neither** approach should be used
  - Count: 428, Percentage: 19%

*n = 2271*
### When you aren’t answering surveys, what do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work at a full-time job</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker for family</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part-time</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected leader</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n = 2271\]

### Which age range do you fall in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 35</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 45</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 55</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 to 65</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 to 75</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather not say</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n = 2271\]
86. How would you describe yourself in terms of your political outlook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Outlook</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Liberal</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Liberal</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Conservative</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Conservative</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 2239

87. Do you identify strongly with any particular political party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 2271

88. Which party do you identify strongly with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Green Party</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Families Party</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1229
Would you like to be kept informed of the results of this survey, new surveys and/or any upcoming events in your area?

- This survey's results: 589 (26%)
- Upcoming surveys: 73 (3%)
- Climate-related events in my area: 81 (4%)
- All of the above: 795 (35%)
- None of the above: 733 (32%)

n = 2271
Oregon communities act on climate

City of McMinnville

A report by the McMinnville Sustainability Committee
May 26, 2009

Southern Oregon Regional Greenhouse Gas Inventory
The carbon footprint of Jackson and Josephine

BEND 2030 vision builds
Progress Toward Oregon’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals

- Greenhouse Gas Emissions to 2000
- Current Business as Usual Forecast (Interpolated between 2008 and 2010)
- Incremental RPS Forecast (Maintaining Full Impact of RPS to 2025)
- Maintain RPS + Boardman Power Plant Replaced with Natural Gas
- Maintain RPS + Boardman Switch + Low Carbon Fuel Standard with 2015 Sunset Removed
- 2020 and 2050 Goal Emissions Reduction Trajectory
Roadmap to 2020 – Seven Propositions

Embed carbon in the planning process
Leverage efficiency of cities
Leverage efficiency of buildings
Shift transportation fuels
Ramp down coal emissions
Capture carbon across the board
Embed carbon in energy prices
Roadmap to 2020:
“Why couldn’t we . . . ?”
Why couldn’t we rethink how we plan our communities, industrial parks, roads and transit, energy and water systems, so carbon makes a difference?

Governor Tom McCall -- 1972
Why couldn’t we design and build cities that are energy and carbon efficient?
Why couldn’t we create tomorrow’s buildings, and rebuild today’s, for superior energy and carbon performance?

[Portland, OR Health Sciences solar south façade]
Why couldn’t we shake the oil habit, and move full speed ahead to electric and other new vehicles and fuels?
Why couldn’t we shake the coal habit, and move rapidly to wind, solar, biofuels, gas, and scaled-up energy efficiency?
Can we imagine taxing carbon inefficiency instead of taxing income or property values?
Embed carbon in the planning process
Leverage efficiency of cities
Leverage efficiency of buildings
Shift transportation fuels
Ramp down coal emissions
Capture carbon across the board
Embed carbon in energy prices
2050 Goal:
80% emissions reduction

2030 Interim Goal:
40% emissions reduction

2030 Objectives

2012 Actions
Prior Climate Plans

1993

CITY of PORTLAND
Carbon Dioxide Reduction Strategy
November 10, 1993

2001

Local Action Plan on GLOBAL WARMING
April 2001

City of Portland & Multnomah County

10% Below 1990 by 2010
2009 = 2% below 1990
15% below 2000

Per Capita Down 20% compared to 1990

Bureau of Planning and Sustainability,
U.S. Energy Information Administration
Eight Climate Action Areas

1. BUILDINGS AND ENERGY
2. URBAN FORM AND MOBILITY
3. CONSUMPTION AND SOLID WASTE
4. URBAN FORESTRY AND NATURAL SYSTEMS
5. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
7. CLIMATE CHANGE PREPARATION
8. LOCAL GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
Accomplishments Since 1990

• Most green buildings in U.S. (LEED), per capita
• Highest hybrid ownership in US, per capita
• Transit ridership more than doubled
• Bike commutes quadrupled
• Vehicle miles traveled down 7% per capita (since 1995)
• Gasoline sales down 20% per capita
• Household energy use down 6% per capita
• Recycling rate more than tripled
• City operations energy projects save $4 million per year
Key Actions for 2011 and 2012

- Portland Plan (www.pdxplan.com)
- Building energy performance scoring system
- District energy
- Develop tool to evaluate carbon emissions from land use and transportation decisions
- Assess climate vulnerabilities and develop adaptation plan
- Neighborhood scale metrics
- Implement citywide food-scrap collection
- Clean Energy Works Oregon (www.cewo.org)
- Solarize Portland
CLIMATE SUMMIT

WHAT IF IT'S A BIG HOAX AND WE CREATE A BETTER WORLD FOR NOTHING?

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE
- PRESERVE RAINFORESTS
- SUSTAINABILITY
- GREEN JOBS
- LIVABLE CITIES
- RENEWABLES
- CLEAN WATER, AIR
- HEALTHY CHILDREN
- ETC. ETC.
Roadmap to 2020 — Seven Propositions
Spring 2011

The State of Oregon has set ambitious greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction goals: a 10% reduction from 1990 levels by 2020 and a 75% reduction from 1990 levels by 2050. Carbon dioxide is the most prevalent GHG; others include methane, ozone, and other heat-trapping gasses. Meeting our reduction goals will require all our efforts.

1 Embed Carbon in the Planning Process
   - Include carbon generated by local transportation and land use decisions in the community planning process.
   - Incorporate meeting Oregon’s GHG reduction goals into State transportation and land use planning.
   - Set 5 to 10 year benchmarks to meet ultimate GHG reduction goals.
   - Incorporate State GHG goals into gas and electric utility planning.

2 Maximize the Energy Efficiency of Cities
   - Redesign neighborhoods so schools, services, and shopping are easily accessible by walking, biking or transit.
   - Maintain existing Urban Growth Boundaries through 2050.
   - Make public transit more convenient, frequent, accessible, affordable.
   - Transport more freight by rail, less in trucks.
   - Create “smarter” roadways to manage traffic flow and to boost efficiency.

3 Increase Efficiency of Buildings
   - Achieve zero total GHG emissions for new buildings.
   - Require existing buildings to meet retrofit efficiency standard.
   - Require the most carbon-efficient fuel for heating and cooling of new buildings.
Roadmap to 2020 – Seven Propositions (continued)

4. Shift to Lower Carbon Transportation Fuels
   - Increase investment in infrastructure for electric vehicles such as recharging stations.
   - Introduce electric, gas, and other low emissions vehicles in Oregon at double the national rate.
   - Support vehicle biofuels production, requiring that biofuels result in a net reduction in GHG emission over their life cycle.

5. Ramp Down Coal Emissions
   - Build a smart grid to integrate new energy generation and distribution technologies with new homes, machines, and vehicles designed to save and store energy.
   - Replace coal generation with increased efficiency, renewable power sources (wind, solar, other), and gas turbines.

6. Reduce and Capture Carbon Across the Board
   - Strengthen community programs to reduce, reuse, recycle materials.
   - Label goods with their carbon content across their full lifecycle from manufacture to disposal.
   - Align forest management practices to reduce and store carbon, e.g. conservation, harvest, fire management.
   - Align agricultural practices with carbon reduction and storage, e.g. soil disturbance, fertilizer use, methane generation.
   - Support industrial efficiency improvements.

7. Embed Carbon in Energy Prices
   - Replace property taxes based on market value with tax based on carbon inefficiency of buildings.
   - Implement fees for using highways at rush hour.
   - Replace gas tax with a fee for miles traveled, discounted for more fuel efficient vehicles.
   - Charge for parking.

For more information: www.keeponcool.org
6.2 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 do not favor; 5 do favor), how much do you favor requiring the state to provide technical or financial assistance to industries that want to become more efficient?

Do not favor

Do favor

1........................2........................3........................4........................5

Comments______________________________________________________________

6.3 Forests and soils sequester carbon by capturing it and holding it in place. One way to do this is to leave trees to grow, especially in older, established forests. On farms, it may mean growing crops using practices that are less disruptive to the soil. What methods, if any, do you favor to increase carbon sequestration? (Check all that apply)

☐ Inform forest and farm owners
☐ Provide incentives to sequester carbon
☐ Require adoption of low-carbon release practices

None of the above

Need more information

Comments______________________________________________________________

Consider Effects of Carbon in Energy Prices

It’s tough to talk about putting a price on carbon when we’re still emerging from a recession. What are your thoughts about taxing carbon as a substitute for other taxes, so that our energy costs and our taxes could stay the same or even go down if we produced less carbon?

7.1 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you to replace the gasoline tax, on a revenue-neutral basis, with another approach whereby everyone pays for access to the transportation system, coupled with fees for the miles we drive and/or the fuel efficiency of our vehicles?

Not important

Very important

1........................2........................3........................4........................5

Comments______________________________________________________________

7.2 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you to replace the property tax, on a revenue-neutral basis, with a revenue source based on the size and operating (energy and carbon) efficiency of each building?

Not important

Very important

1........................2........................3........................4........................5

Comments______________________________________________________________

7.3 Taxes or fees on carbon use, depending on how they are designed, could affect low-income households disproportionately. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 do not favor; 5 do favor), how much do you favor requiring the state to provide assistance to industries that want to become more efficient?

Not important

Very important

1........................2........................3........................4........................5

Comments______________________________________________________________

7.4 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 do not favor; 5 do favor), how much do you favor a national carbon tax or cap that would require everyone to share in the cost of reducing carbon emissions?

Do not favor

Do favor

1........................2........................3........................4........................5

Comments______________________________________________________________

Thank you again for your valuable guidance. These are difficult issues and choices that we all face in the years ahead and we appreciate your taking the time to consider them thoughtfully.

Please continue this dialogue with us. We are gathering email addresses of people who are willing, from time to time but not more than two or three times a year, to respond to an Internet-based survey. The objective is to check in with you and others on these and other important issues frequently as the state continues its journey to meet our targets. We will not share your information.

Name:________________________________________ Email Address: _________________________________

Phone (optional):__________________________ Zip Code:___________________________

Thank you again!
2 Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Cities

Close to 70% of global greenhouse gas emissions come from our urban areas. By the same token, with their more compact form and efficient buildings and transportation systems, cities are the greatest savings are possible. What are the best ways to capture these gains?

2.1 Retain the Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) in Oregon’s six largest urban areas as they now exist, focusing development and growth where they will support more efficient buildings and services.
- High priority requirement near term (1-3 years)
- High priority requirement mid-term (4-6 years)
- Medium priority
- Low priority
Comments ________________________________

2.2 Keep the UGBs as they currently exist, while allowing exceptions for new industrial facilities adjacent. ___ Yes ___ No
Comments ________________________________

2.3 How important is it to you that cities be encouraged to plan and redevelop “20-minute” neighborhoods, where shopping, services, entertainment and access to transit are accessible by walking?
- High priority requirement near term (1-3 years)
- High priority requirement mid-term (4-6 years)
- Medium priority
- Low priority
Comments ________________________________

3 Leverage Efficiency of Buildings

Half the buildings that will exist in 2050 have yet to be constructed. New structures can be designed to be energy and carbon efficient or even carbon neutral. Existing buildings can be retrofitted to realize energy savings.

3.1 How important is it that we amend building codes to require new buildings to increase energy and carbon efficiency by at least 50% by 2030?
- High priority requirement near term (1-3 years)
- High priority requirement mid-term (4-6 years)
- Medium priority
- Low priority
Comments ________________________________

3.2 Solar roofs are another way to reduce emissions. On a scale of 1-9, do you favor incentives or regulations to install them on all new buildings?
(Circle one)
1.................2.................3.................4.................5.................6.................7.................8.................9
- Not important
- Very important
Comments ________________________________

3.3 Electricity and natural gas are available to heat homes and businesses in much of Oregon. How important is it that we require building owners to select the most carbon-efficient fuel if costs (equipment and operating) are about the same?
- High priority requirement near term (1-3 years)
- High priority requirement mid-term (4-6 years)
- Medium priority
- Low priority
Comments ________________________________

4 Alternative Transportation Fuels

Mobility is important to all Oregonians. Nearly 40% of total greenhouse gas emissions are related to transportation. How to preserve our transportation choices while decreasing vehicle emissions is the challenge.

4.1 What percentage of the time do you use the following types of transportation?
- _______ private auto _______ public transit _______ bicycle _______ walking

4.2 If you wanted to leave your car at home more often, what would need to change?
Comments ________________________________

www.keeporegoncool.org
1. **Embed Carbon in the Planning Process**

   **Response/Suggestions:**

   - A carbon impact statement needed for each development in the planning stage.
   - We can consider pricing scale based on proposed development (e.g. SDCs).
   - Bike racks, park ‘n’ ride, reduction in price can be used to incentivize these types of planning... more transportation options.
   - There is a disconnect between policy and implementation. There is no accountability to meet goals.
   - Importance of behavioral change to VMT: this should be a result of planning
   - A potential VMT tax would make travel personal.
   - Emphasize in planning the “20 minute neighborhoods“ to reduce sprawl.
   - Limiting building size creates whole, more sustainable communities.
   - Statewide planning plan from 1972 is broken.
   - Pull in business interests in for “point to point” commuter solutions for incentivizing sustainability.

2. **Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Cities**

   **The benefits would include:**

   - Reduce waste
   - Reduce GHGs
   - Happier living for all creatures
   - Bigger carbon capture- big impact
   - People in touch with each other
   - Easier biking and getting around.
   - Aesthetic life
   - Flow throughout the city
   - Parks space
   - Healthier living.
   - Spend less money - be efficient with/$$
   - Less dependence on oil.
   - Leave car at home- reduce air pollution, reduce $$.
   - Lower infrastructure costs
   - Energy cost savings – proximity.
   - Smaller homes – commuting
   - Walking/biking- healthy
   - Well-being, bring socioeconomic groups together(connectedness)
   - Talk to people more
   - Exercise
• Local economic resilience (trans interrupts)
• Responsibility – awareness/attn.
• Transit corridors can drive development
• Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Cities Cont’d

The challenges would include:

• Market barriers, financing
• Long-term change, won’t work for 2020
• Costs
• Potholes
• Density does not equal space.
• Different than what we’re used to (paradigm shift): resistance
• Intergenerational – how to integrate entire community?
• Crosswalks short
• More complex than economics
• Bike riding currently is dangerous. Busy streets, cars, etc..
• Developers say the market may not support
• Expensive to re-do bike-friendly transit
• Lack of awareness/education
• Financing, banks, risk on what isn’t ‘proven’
• Big box retail and mcmansion model hides costs
• School closures
• Taxes and service politics / neighborhood subsidies
• Statewide planning policy—prescriptive, legalistic
• Loss of green space and natural resources
• Hyper-individualism
• Existing public safety rules/bldg codes
• Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Cities Cont’d
• Public transit on train—freight by rail
• Biking to the bus—almost in conflict
• Land use policies, density
• Public health and safety regulators inhibit use of new, more sustainable technologies, like grey-water use, rainwater collection, and water-free toilets.
• Expanding UGBs makes it harder to get around by public transit and meet 20-min neighborhood goal.
• Making transit cheaper (or free) and making car use (e.g. parking) more costly and less convenient will increase the convenience, frequency and use of public transit.
• Maintaining green space.
• Lots of people don’t want higher density.
• Potential pollution.
• Job creation (do we need space?)
• Brownfields reuse.
• Cultural expectations
• Existing infrastructure may not support
• Possible impact to water and wastewater treatment systems.
How can we make efficient cities possible?

- Villages within city: 20 minute neighborhoods
- Zoning: mixed uses, accessible services.
- Inner city gardens, food available to urban center
- Have green and garden spaces- build in, as part of planning
- Good transportation: bike and walking routes good crossings.
- Dedicated bike paths.
- Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Cities Cont’d
- Connectivity for bike lanes.
- Public transit.
- Sidewalk connections, funding or alternatives.
- Pedestrian streets
- Sharing resources – cars, tools, other, libraries for resources.
- Satellite aerial mapping in car
- Car sharing / Car pooling
- More localized bus routes.
- More perma-culture- whole systems design for urban areas
- Healthy buildings – design standards, energy and living, recycled materials- require (social good)
- UGB may not get us the protection for recourse we need outside cities (agricultural shadow)
- Collect water in cities/ challenge.
- How does UGB line up with school districts?
- Take a bigger view- beyond local. Examples: military power, war: these impact us
- Education: teach youth to live sustainably, gardens for the homeless by the homeless (Santa Cruz provides a model): grain and fruit storage facilities at city edge and center
- Employ folks to do analysis for education.
3. **Leverage Efficiency of Buildings**

- Better marketing for incentives for upgrade for low income housing
- How to encourage owners to upgrade when they don’t pay bill.
- Marketing of EWEB Incentives.
- Water & energy budgets for homes
- Scorecards on all buildings for consumers
- Better water efficiency – gray water – water catchment- leaves for mulching
- Strategies for better ROI homeowners
- Nurturing a culture of long term thinking
- Energy and water independence
- Insurance for people who are financially burdened from upgrades
- Working with neighborhood associations to ‘pitch in’ for community energy programs that everyone would benefit from.
- Energy co-ops and water
- Benefits of multiple people.
- Raise energy costs.

4. **Shift Transportation Fuels**

*Response/Suggestions:*

- Increase $ for electric vehicles etc.
- Renewable source
- Must get off gas and oil
- Need better batteries; education of folks re: expectations
- Downsizing vehicle size.
- How to replace gas taxes.
- Neighbor chang. Stans. Lcc, work. Apt. houses
- Don’t replace hwys; maintain existing.
- Move freight by rail; develop more rail
- VMT tax to replace gas tax.
- Eliminate studded tires; roads last longer.
- Eliminate ethanol subsidy
- Car-sharing
- 50 mile radius for school sports
- Kids walk further to bus stops
- Improve intra/inter bus transport
- Where does the money come from?
- Long term vs. Short term costs.
- Check research already done.
- Free mass transit.
- Benefits of urban growth boundaries: Reduced fuel costs (individuals)/use, reduced CO2, More walkability/livability. –Preserved farmlands. More integration of classes/land uses? Decreased food deserts. –Know more neighbors/disaster resilience
• Transportation Fuels / Efficient Cities cont’d
• Challenges of urban growth boundaries: Transportation system doesn’t support UGB, social inertia, zoning code reinforces segregation of land uses- Are we a team or a city? -Big box mentality – preserving neighborhood character.
• Opportunities: -Decentralization of systems – Dividing lots and houses to accommodate density
Strong neighborhoods – support the elderly/the young.

Actions:

• Long range planning
• Nodal development
• Increase neighborhood identity
• Less parking
• Infill
• Subdivision of lots
• Medium density?
• Building codes that provide daylight.
• Public involvement and education for under-represented groups ($$, age)
• Involve other towns in these meetings (breakdown geographic silos)
• Public education – new media outlets
• Decentralization of resources/utilities
• Transportation options

5. Ramp Down Coal Emissions, Ramp Up Efficiency, Renewables

Response/Suggestions:

• Burning coal anything is bad.
• Need to institute emission fees on Co2 and other pollutants.
• Water conservation means energy conservation; pumping H2O takes energy. Urban and rural.
• Urban agriculture may increase water use.
• Pumping of water is a peak energy use.
• Smart meters for water use is an important step.
• Smart meters in homes and neighbor energy use (competition) is an effective strategy to reduce energy use.
• Smart meters are expensive.
• Many renewable are intermittent. Energy management will be important.
• Water storage as an energy storage method. Pump water uphill when there’s excess power.
• Capture energy on release of municipal water.
• Biomass to energy objected to for health reasons.
• Asthma plume of pollution from point source- All opposed.
• American lung assoc. / lane co. health advis bd.
• Biomass considered renewable; should it be?
• Strong concerns about biomass as a strategy.
• Smart Grid across Eugene within 3 – 5 years (eweb). Electric vehicles are a motivating factor for that investment.
• Not just electric vehicles or water storage- we need to look into many methods of energy storage.
• Balanced energy mix (renewable need to figure out balance). Hydro peaks in winter, solar in summer. Identify the right mix and make a plan to get there.
• Clarification of EWEB’s weatherization
• Commercial and residential cohousing
• Earthquakes.
• Low Income Homeowners and renters -Funding (needed) for this group
• Oregon Housing Community Services
• Expand Incentives for private owners
• Consider control or rent.
• Incentives for Contractors
• Annual Audits from Utility
• Extend Energy Efficiency loans
• Leases on energy efficient systems
• Clean Energy Works

6. Capture Carbon Across the Board

Response/Suggestions:

• It’s the end of civilization.
• There are few ways of currently capturing carbon. We need to look for things we can do, learn to live more harmoniously, reduce footprint.
• Reduce, reuse, recycle
• Consume less = less energy need.
• Economy dependent on consumption, consumerism.
• BRING (recycling organization): partner.
• Car sharing. Getting away from car use.
• Education
• We don’t know that our choices impact carbon use.
• How do you require labeling?
• Carbon tax based on label.
• Partner with California, PNW.
• Law/regulation
• Like the bottle bill.
• Use standardized tables for manufacturing.
• Attract manufacturers to our carbon-efficient local energy.
• Carbon content of packaging.
• Ingredients list but not packaging.
• Forest practices
• Promote sustainable forestry.
• Label sources of wood products – life cycle analysis.
• Capturing carbon is a limited, partial solution at best.
• Land use changes, deforestation, are significant source of GHG emissions
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- PNW forests are great storage of carbon: stop cutting them.
- Price carbon sequestration to value forests.
- Large-scale ag is oil-intensive, we have tech for sustainable ag, we need political will.
- Sequesters carbon by leaving fossil fuels in the ground.
- No-till soils store carbon
- Bio-char is good.
- Intact ecosystems store carbon (good). Disturb release (bad)- see land use
- Population growth frustration

7. Embed Carbon in Energy Prices

Response/Suggestions:

- Social negative: low income/fixed income people may have low efficiency homes which would require more of their income to fix than a wealthier person.
- What if people can’t afford retrofits?
- Allowances and loans would be important.
- Carbon pricing of homes: Home are important- a related tax would speak to people because it’s universal.
- How would the carbon pricing on homes be set up? That is a key question. What if it was carbon efficiency rather than energy efficiency?
- Total value factor of property is important.
- What about additional cost for negative-impact things like clothes lines prohibitions?
- How about business energy tax credits?
- We should look at this from a benefits side rather than penalties.
- Group members opposed to cap trade; one can’t think of anything worse.
- What about making energy consumption public? (Angus notes that that has a counter effect for some individuals)
- Provide access to information about energy use (e.g. it could be required for houses for sale)
- Let’s think about larger-scale incentives that go beyond the private home.
- Carbon fees could be couples with subsidies for low/no carbon generation.
- Fee bates: higher costs for vehicles that use more energy. Extra $$ goes to incentives.
- Steve worries about penalizing people for where they live.
- A transportation planner asks: why do we use the word efficiency rather than conservation? Where has the use of the word ‘conservation’ gone?
- Conservation emphasizes the important point; to be frugal and change behaviors, rather than just changing products.
- Least cost is also used. Maximizing efficiency is more essential
- Replacing property tax with carbon tax:
- Could put people out of their houses (if they have a large or inefficient home but a low income).
- Older properties would pay higher taxes.
- Would need ‘kickback’ for lower income people.
- How can it work?
- We have to consider utility companies’ power- financial and political. They will be against this.
- We should look at the health effects.
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- We should go ‘higher on the food chain’ and target businesses, etc; costs will ‘trickle down’ to consumers.
- Group members express concern re: equity. People who happen to live in a place with high carbon energy would be impacted more harshly.
- The issue is reducing carbon: Don’t (We shouldn’t) subsidize making carbon! Put savings into efficiencies instead.
- How will it be implemented?
- What about taxing carbon? This can be a funding source.
- The social good is not built into the economy.
- Social equity: low-income retrofits.
- Issue: rental properties. There need to be possibilities for renters to invest in efficiencies.
- Who would implement a carbon tax?
- Carbon tax: revenues for renewable and low income.
- How do we get past powerful opposing interests?
- Carbon tax on goods and products. How about that? Cars?
- We should tax things that we don’t want!! Rather than things we DO want (like income).
- Cars and auto infrastructure: tax it?
- How about charging for parking? (Eugene doesn’t charge for parking)
- London charges for going into the central city by car.
- Pay to drive during rush hour.
- Improve transit system which is lacking and is not set up to solve social problems. More users will increase services.
- Issue of funding: Federal and local sources provide limitations.
- Free public transit and car use is expensive.
- Many of the above affect low-income people.
- Tax luxuries!
- Many of the above require infrastructure and up front costs.
- Tax above average carbon-using cars.
- Make the information about energy usage available to the public.
- Do you really need a tax?
- Payment for positive impacts on the environment.
- Carbon tax involves a social equity cost.
- What we name the tax is important: marketing.

Additional comments:

- Wants to impact future RR development.
- Fruit available to residents via a fruit and berry corridor throughout the City
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Small Group Discussion Comments
June 2, 2011
Portland/Multnomah County, Oregon

Shift to Lower Carbon Transportation Fuels

Discussion Leader: Stuart Farmer

- Why switch to lower carbon-based fuels?
  - Fewer emissions
  - More funding for Street Car to reduce the number of cars in the City
  - Some actions serve a small population (charging stations); is there a political will?
  - No biofuels; cause poor people to suffer from higher fuel prices
  - Higher standards will drive up fuel costs
  - Electric vehicles shouldn’t be tied to lower carbon fuel standards
  - Hybrid combination of coal and solar
  - Unintended consequences of penalizing Canadian oil sand drilling techniques
  - Clean diesel to increase mileage and reduce carbon

Coal Emissions

Discussion Leader: Tom Armstrong

Debate between Person 1 (climate skeptic) and Person 2 (climate action):
- Person 2: Need broader regional view: Pacific Northwest and Southwest (climate refugees)
- Carbon market
- Broader regional view (PNW and SW Climate Refugees)
- (Discussions should be) science-based; what can we achieve?
  - Great Depression example; doesn’t prove GHG reduction in global terms (1)
  - Science at odds with planning (1)
  - Total impact of coal; CO2 (2)
  - Renewal lessens those impacts
  - Do you get more energy out of solar with embedded energy in the panel production over the lifecycle of the production? (1)
  - Wind has environmental impacts on the natural system. (1)
  - Oil feels running out of hydrofracting impact; sun and geothermal will also be there; need to tap into this source) sooner rather than later to benefit (2)
  - No peak oil; Pennsylvania Natural Gas reserves estimates continue to rise (1)
  - Natural gas economy fuels hydrogen economy and is inexpensive (1)
  - Gas still has a transmission problem (2)
  - All energy has transport problems (1)
  - Need to decentralize energy production (2)
  - Too distributed; becomes too expensive (1)
Capture Carbon

Discussion Leader: Sarah Brownstein

- Consider consumption rather than production of GHGs
- Bulk of GHG involved in food systems are generated in food production, rather than transportation of food.
- Supporting rural development to find a balance that considers GHG/rural hubs
- Consider a system social/economic equity disparities in this work.
- Eliminate federal subsidies for monocrops; switch them to organic, small-scale farmers
- Find an appropriate way of communicating lifecycle costs so they understand and have a point of comparison between items. A way of measuring full life cycle costs.
- We need to consider food waste that is wasted rather than consumed; post-purchase, non-consumed food.

Embed Carbon in (State and Local) Planning

Discussion Leader: John Cole

- Recreation travel options (2)
- Note % of transportation that comes from exurban areas commuting into urban areas
- 20-minute neighborhood extended by bike and public transportation
- School siting
- Building codes
- Expand regional planning to other metropolitan areas
- Habitat restoration; urban and rural (low economics)
- Adaptation planning (e.g., water levels and flooding)
- Common ground

Efficiency of Buildings

Discussion Leader: Jaimes Valdez

- Some concern about mandates/regulations from Planning Department for retrofits
- Create joint gains between construction projects, homeowners and insulators
- Smart meters inside house – energy info more accessible
- Strengthen codes
- Calculating building efficiency – more info from utility; at point of sale (build into real estate market) – credibility, transparency of measurement
- Innovative building design
- Accessible low-cost loans for energy financing
- Deregulation of public utilities to allow alternate suppliers
- Market to consumers
- Educate architects and contractors – require qualifications
- Put energy assessment tool online; mapping e.g., www.portlandmaps.com
Embed Carbon in Energy Prices

Discussion Leader: Kyle Diesner

- Property taxes
  - What happens as revenues decrease?
  - Need a way to measure the carbon efficiency of buildings
  - Administrative costs will be high
- Utility should be included; reflect the carbon value of the energy source
- Glad to see cap and trade dropped.
- If it is truly in energy price, property taxes shouldn’t be necessary
- VMT taxes are not an incentive to reduce carbon intensity
- Backwards to place taxes on property or VMT
- What does congestion pricing have to do with reducing carbon (Metro study showed an incidental relationship)
- Similar to parking
- Seem to be designed to shift people from cars to mass transit; mass transit uses more energy than small cars
- Parking is already charged downtown
- Fees for rush hour don’t reduced driving; just shift timing of trips
- VMT HR 3311; GPS tracking on our cars?
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Small Group Discussion Comments
June 2, 2011
Bend, Oregon

Efficiency in Cities

- Bus transit to schools - idling
- Uses more buses, fewer parents driving
- Route planning
- More options
- Commuter carpool for kids from school
- More accessible queuing at school
- School siting – where people live
- More smaller schools
- In existing neighborhoods, like vacant commercial building
- More node-style development, like framework
- School, commercial, jobs, amenities and services
- Commercial/residential nodes like those in Bend development code
- Idea – location of 18th and Empire filling in what’s missing – satellite centers like NW X-ing.
- Main Street, commercial, living/work, thriving center
- Idea – east Bend branch of libpar
- Node idea – location of Bend east library
- West-side – Newport and Galveston (potential satellites)

Two sets of [building/development] Codes
1. New neighborhoods
   a. Spacing standards for new neighborhood centers
2. Infill and redevelopment
   a. Incentivize development like this

Two additional thoughts on new neighborhood centers:
1. Central emp areas served by transit
2. Dispersing common areas along key travel routes

Different standards for transportation system in central locations to encourage higher density housing – that also supports transit

Satellite centers with complete streets/boulevards
- like 5th/6th Streets in Redmond
- new street standards to support satellite centers
- eastside – Reed market
- Greenwood from 4th – 12th
- Division Street
- Benchmark alternative to no UGB expansion – what does this look like?
Building Efficiency

- Every building is different
- Evaluate each building for individual envelope
- Look at utility bills, i.e., kilowatts and therm – convert to carbon
- Disregard Blue Sky
- Discover the BIG energy users
- Heat loss – thermal photography
- Monitoring – example: Dent Instruments
- Both commercial and residential
  - Residential:
    - focus on leakage, emphasize existing programs
    - US DOT programs – grants to communities
    - property tax = carbon tax to start, to not penalize low-income
    - Monitoring device to show real time use (i.e., Google power meter)
    - Could energy monitors help – would be more effective in larger commercial building
    - Power is still cheap enough that reducer use is not a motivator
    - multi-tenant buildings
    - Independent energy assessment needs to free
      - Determine which buildings are candidates for audit
- Needs to be mix of motivation – incentives; regulatory, technology
- Align Oregon goals of architecture 2030 – Design/Building challenge: Carbon Neutral by 2030
- Start with all public buildings, i.e., street layout to take advantage of solar
- Require programmable thermostats

What percentage of fossil fuels can be realistically replaced?

- Shared grid
- Replace coal – no more coal
- Biomass – missing – forest hearth (?) – couldn’t make out last word
- Carbon-based fuel
- Boardman – crop selection issue
- Cause-effect – efficiency
  - Humans not having negative (not sure that’s what it says) impact
- Market demands will drive efficiency
- Invest in R&D, drive market efficiency
- Nuclear – support – some, opposed as well
- Home efficiency
- More home-based programs
- More fuel choices – NG
- Clean energy works model
- Loan-type program
- Taking all subsidies away
- Energy to CA
- Subsidies to coal, oil too
Embed Carbon in Energy Prices

- Reaction to idea of embedding carbon in energy prices
  - Where we need to go
  - Taxes on new buildings, not old ones
  - Need to change behavior: have taxes come in gradually, not all at once. Don’t be too specific,
  - e.g., reward for efficient building, not specific features

- What would this look like for your neighborhood?
  - Choices would be made, e.g., buy house w/solar properties
  - Taxes wouldn’t help much now, and would force people into new behavior
  - Cut taxes for using lower emission vehicles
  - Not fair to grandfather older houses…
  - Need to look at “unintended consequences” – how taxes would affect different users
  - Gasoline tax is declining source of revenue – can use “vehicle miles traveled”, what’s coming

- How can taxes be implemented?
  - Build incentive in housing tax to have more efficient house – will lead to smaller, more efficient houses
  - Long-term goal – people live in smaller houses, closer together

- How to balance need for tax revenue with idea to incentivize more efficiency?
  - Congestion pricing idea – may be better to work on efficiency rather than go to the trouble of setting up congestion pricing
  - Idea – smart meters so people know what they are using at any given time
  - Public transportation – need to plan carefully when instituting public transportation
Small Group Discussion Comments
June 16, 2011
Apollo Alliance

Replacing Coal Emissions with Renewable and Natural Gas-fired Generation

- 3 – 10 cents/kwh – Wind – Feed-in tariff
- 7 – 15 cents/kwh – Gas
- 1 – 2 cents/kwh – Energy Efficiency
  (expensive for low income)
  Solar – Clean energy works
  Financing?
  Solar as a service
  Avoided transmission costs
  Distributed Generation
  Point source vs. site source

How do we balance intermittent renewables?
- Smart grid
- Demand Response
- Voltage optimization

Efficiency of Buildings

- Weatherize homes
  - CEW (Clean energy works) – PDX
- Scale up CEW model
- Retrofit public buildings
- Problem – Rentals – need to be addressed
- Market can move better weatherized/energy efficient houses
- Should not be solved on backs of working people
- Cost of retrofits – big issue
- Need to make fuels – new buildings and upgrades affordable to all

Carbon Reduction and Capture

- We need to act in all sectors no matter how small – even small measures help to lower rate increases
- Global warming is not human-caused and the government should not be involved in regulation or setting goals
- most efficient mechanism is a carbon tax
- find out what other countries are doing with coal power-plant sequestration
- agricultural practices
- labeling carbon content – give consumers the info and choices
- efficiency savings significant for businesses – make companies more competitive
- nurseries
  - food processing
  - Best practices
• wineries
• capture methane from livestock and agricultural production
• harness economic self-interest

**Carbon Pricing**

• Cap and dividend – limit carbon upstream (utilities, refineries, oil importers). Money distributed to citizens. Carbon-intensive goods cost more, consumers decide what to purchase. (alternative to C & T)
• Differences between OR/WA tax codes/costs create extra traffic/movement. OR & WA should work together.
• UN – goals, but not much enforcement
• upfront versus lifecycle costs (drive 15 miles to save 5 cents on gas)
• People need easier access to information. Carbon price gives info when people are making decisions.
• like Appliance E. Ratings
• taxation pushback:
  o problems with “traditional” C & T (trading part)
  o individual action vs. industry regulation
  o (smaller impact) (bigger impact)
• inequity concerns – reduce property tax for those who can already afford EE
• Solar – takes as much E to manufacture as it saves
• tax inefficient E more
  o Will this save $ in the long run?
• Berkeley Micro loans for EE on homes, repaid through E savings on utility bill
• What we’re saving is more than $. – Community, health
• Efficiency of system. Would carbon tax save C and change behavior?
• Value greater than money

**Carbon in Planning**

• Goals are not aggressive enough
• not enough implementation urgency
• plans are not “personal” enough
• overly policy-driven
• simplifying a personal/family plan and support for personal lifestyle enhancements
• planning needs to consider non-energy alternatives rather than low-energy alternatives
• stop planning for inefficiencies
• embed GHG reduction goals in all planning processes
• updating building, etc. codes and permitting (re-prioritize safety lower and carbon impact higher)
• building efficiency “scores” disclosed to potential buyers
• “8th Component” = Leadership
  o Lead by example
Efficiency of Cities

- alignment with Portland Plan, CAP
  - explore intersections
- creating sustainable 20-minute neighborhoods
  - food production, access to services
  - ease of access (bikes, etc.) (walking)
  - quality of life
- implementation? Transform over time or start from scratch
- social segmentation? Telling people to stay in their own “pocket”
- focus inside the city
- How much do we have already? Can we build on what we have without going overboard?
  - overboard could be:
    - forced choice, everyone has to do it
    - taking infrastructure away from cars for bikes
    - in MPOs, only 10% of people currently have walking neighborhood options; how to increase percentage?
- Preparing for aging population, how to accommodate the baby boom?
- Access to buses, grocery stores
- Buses being cut back, rates going up, and adding more light rail – move to prioritize buses, make bus system work for more people
- more options for people who need it
- maximize transportation, both buses and light rail
- new fuels for buses: natural gas, electricity
- electric buses may be less noxious, people might be more willing to live next to them
- new hybrid buses - + +
- cities already green, make them more livable
- take simple steps
- roadmap too drastic, too dominated by people outside of Oregon, too expensive
- roadmap not too drastic, pretty much on target
  - aim for public ownership of the plan
  - legislature should enact bills to implement
  - crucial to survival
- think of Big Look process – got watered down, how to take a plan and implement meaningful change
- where does state money come from to implement measures?
  - state, federal
  - we’re paying for our services through taxes, why not get what we want?
- how to get grocery stores to people now outside of walking distance? Only 30% of people in Portland can now
- keep UGBs as is, maybe even shrink
- consolidate customer base to support businesses, good services
- yes, maintain UGBs, maybe even shrink
- agree to more rail, fewer trucks
- NY, most extreme example, think of Main Street instead, that used to be more preferable
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• Intros/what brought you here?
  o Following process all along
  o “Planner wannabe” wants to be part of the process
  o Wants to hear what state is actually doing
  o Pays attention to “environmental office”
  o “We’re going too far”
  o Interest in urban planning
  o Congress for new urbanization
  o Deeply concerned about global warming
  o Interested because “nay-sayer” on global warming

• Governments don’t walk the talk
  o Local gov’ts don’t actually construct in efficient ways

• Portland Plan is in line with roadmap
  o How to we make 20-minute neighborhoods
  o Wants a city more like small town
  o Increase quality of life

• How extreme would implementation be?
  o Would they bulldoze and start over?
  o Seems like they want to herd people to stay in one location

• Think we already have walking/biking/transit
  o Overboard = taking roads for cars and turning them over to bikes
  o Don’t force people to do things – “What if we don’t want to only live in one neighborhood?”

• People deserve choice to live in walkable neighborhood
  o Esp. elderly who can’t drive
  o Also a lot of people don’t want to have to drive

• Tri-Met keeps cutting bus service and increasing the cost
  o But they spend money on light-rail
  o Why can’t they just keep buses as they are
  o They are cut back too much

• Roadmap calls for maximizing transit
  o Buses are more practical – we need to find other fuel sources for them
  o Buses are noisy and smelly
  o We should get electric buses
  o Hybrid buses are great

• Cleaner, quiet city living = better living in cities
• We don’t need drastic measures
• Roadmap is taken from UN directive – it’s expensive and unnecessary
• The roadmap is on target – it’s not too drastic
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- Plan should come to pass
- Legislature should enact plan
- It is representative of needs of Oregonians

- Worry to actual actions will be watered down/meaningless
  - State should provide $ to cities to actually implement plans

- If we already are paying for services, why not get what we want?
- Not all of PDX is walkable – there aren’t stores everywhere
- Should shrink or maintain urban growth boundary
- More freight by rail better than trucks
  - B-line bike shipping = good (used in downtown PDX)
- Main Street does not need petroleum
  - We lost more pleasant way of living – need to get back to the basics
- Thank you to global warming commission – well-done – “I agree with all of it”
- If NYC is prime example – I don’t want high cost of living and high crime
- If we want more freight are we doing away with North American Union Hwy corridor
- Government subsidizing the way we use land
  - It’s not working
  - Urban building is not working – need more mixed housing and walkable communities
  - Good new urbanist communities have continued to thrive in economic downturn

- Not all Portlanders have walking access to grocery store
- People in suburbs are being pushed into big cities
  - Their resources (i.e., hospitals) are being shut down and being moved into cities
  - Creating ghost towns
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Feedback Summary – Written Copies (not online version)
Roadmap to 2020 Public Workshop Feedback Form – Spring 2011

The following section is organized by region: Portland, Eugene, and Bend as was indicated by the zip code on the forms. Where no zip code was provided we have included those at the end of each appropriate section labeled as such.

Overall
In your opinion, what is the most important thing the State should do or keep doing to address climate change?

Portland, Oregon Region
Zip codes: 97027 97030 97034 97201 97202 97206 97211 97212 97213 97214 97219 97220 97231 97233 97302 97381
(Total Feedback forms: 18)

- Moving our energy from out-of-state coal power plants to local renewable resources.
- Stop funding this global warming farce! Get rid of all this environmental BS - that's where they should start. Could put that $ into other more critical things like police, etc.
- Prepare for disasters such as severe flooding, tsunami, volcano, fires by establishing "sister" communities 90 miles apart, roughly, for emergency evacuation on a pre-arranged basis. In other words, understand global warming will cause unexpected disasters and plan response on a community to community basis.
- An overall plan and set of strategies to reduce GHGs
- Everything!
- Stop segregating neighborhoods - mixed use (horizontal and vertical) must be a statewide planning goal (#20)!
- Rebate Oregonians to cash in or trade in their cars that are of certain years; Eliminate coal plant; carbon tax 2nd home-owners/vacation home/resort home owners for dual emissions generation "heating empty structures".
- Create a cap and dividend program. Tax the polluters and reward the consumers who can avoid using carbon-intensive products and services.
- Create a comprehensive plan to address climate change that includes all sectors - public, private, non-profit, academic
- Low to moderate income homes should have access to weatherization and retrofit that is affordable.
- Providing a framework for action that spells out roles for many different sectors as well as individual citizens. (Make sure to involve equity considerations in all strategies.)
- Nothing. The climate goes through small changes naturally.
- Engage people - invite them, their ideas, creativity. Aim higher. Stop subsidizing fossil fuels: hybrid cars, HE furnaces, electric cars - they all use fossil fuels. Human Power Renewable
- Educate the public. Create incentives for climate control measures in citizen and private use.
- reduce coal burning (Boardman)
- Increase energy efficiency of buildings - whether new construction or retrofits. It's very important, however, that low and middle income families have assistance, so they can get fair access to all the goods of energy efficient dwellings.
• Include the climate question in every projected agency action and proposed legislation, and the public must be brought along with continuous education about the causes and effects of climate change. Engage the press as well as government sources.
• A sane, reality-based energy policy. Improve the connections between emergency preparedness and sustainability. Increasingly use existing public buildings for community buildings.

**Eugene, Oregon Region**

*Zip codes:* 97401 97402 97403 97404 97405 97431 97440 97470 97471 97478

(Total Feedback forms: 31)

• Through economic incentives help folks reduce energy use. Provide electric car charging stations, light rail, and buses. Higher gas prices. In-fill within urban boundaries. Support local businesses and farmers. Get the word out to reduce buying; buy used, buy local.
• Dissuade people from driving: make it easier and easier to use public transportation and harder and harder to drive (like the situation in Manhattan where I lived for many years).
• Carbon tax, pedal-power. Also see attached comments - typed sheet
• Reduce fossil fuel - encourage energy conservation
• Limit urban sprawl
• Make carbon use cost more than moving to carbon emissions reduction. Money talks. Get moving NOW.
• Education at all levels of consumption
• Biting the bullet and spending (and raising) more money to do the things we need to do sooner rather than later, instead of saying we can't afford it. (carbon tax would help)
• Reduce population; penalize auto use while rewarding public transport and biking; high-speed internet. On a federal level, raise gas to more than $4/gallon, index, use proceeds for public transport, biking.
• Tax pollution; stop biomass plants
• Do many small things that are doable now to move us along and keep doing that over time.
• Emphasize that climate change is real, what the downsides will be, and that making changes to reduce GHG emissions or to adjust to the impacts result in a higher quality of life for all.
• Move forward with recommendations of the state's adaptation plan that both reduces emissions and increases resiliency
• Improve infrastructure of mass public transportation around the state
• Tax the emission of greenhouse gases, and use the funds generated to change infrastructure to make CO2 and methane emission less likely.
• Adaptation to what are now inevitable impacts; 2.) Restructure and remove incentives supporting wasteful CO2 uses; 3.) institutionalize new incentives supporting changes; 4.) cap and gradually reduce CO2 levels through (2) and (3) above, coupled with reasonable regulations.
• Encouraging multi-use developments and small neighborhoods that have full amenities; Making it difficult to drive in towns.
• Contract with the U of O, OSU and PSU to constantly do research on relevant topics and develop in-house institutes to contract with cities and counties to develop and maintain them as sustainable communities. The U of O is already doing a form of this. Comments added on back of form: Why don't you consider rationing of gasoline and electricity? Maybe citizens would support rationing more than any other approach. If you don't ask then you don't know.
• Set an example of what should be done.
• Use advanced technologies and incentives for same; do not subsidize production of toxins or toxic systems
• Working collaboratively with neighboring states to institute a carbon tax (or an equivalent) to encourage the reduction of carbon and encourage alternatives
• Promote increased density, preservation of the UGB and high quality soils near population centers. Agriculture and transportation are huge contributors to GHGs.
• To start: we should always refer to the "climate crisis". The city should push the state and federal government to help here and to do more help in general. We need to put homeless people inside in efficient shelters.
• get publicly-funded campaign - Campaign Finance Reform - until we have politicians that are not puppets for BIG money, real, substantive change will not happen. Also - a leader or leaders willing to speak truth and educate the public about the science and reality of the triple threat - climate change, population growth and peak oil. Also, local food and basic needs are huge for slowing climate change and surviving the "shifts".
• Address the necessity of flat or declining total VMT directly. It has several important implications that shouldn't be left obscure. Biological carbon sequestration in forests and other intact ecosystems is an important part of the equation. Yet our own state forests are slated for accelerated cutting!
• Provide a combination of significant incentives and mandates for energy efficiency, land use and alternative transportation development.
• Thank you for the opportunity to attend the "Roadmap to 2020" workshop in Eugene and participate in this very important process. I've been involved for the past 8 years in global warming grassroots activism on the local, state and national level. In my opinion, most important is following through on implementing the mandates passed by the 2007 Oregon legislature. I live in rural Douglas County, not an urban area, but I believe rural areas with population centers should look to urban planning for models to preserve the livability of our downtown cores. We global warming activists must not allow ourselves to be marginalized as "elites" by ignoring low-income people who will suffer most if climate change is not limited.
• The state of Oregon should support active forest management to reduce the risk of wildfire. Wildfires generate significant amounts of greenhouse gas. Simply walking away and ignoring the forest is not good either for the state's environment or economy.

**Bend, Oregon Region**

*Zip codes: 97701 97702*  
*(Total Feedback forms: 14)*

• Take advantage of large factory roofs and warehouse roofs for solar arrays in cities and towns close to the existing grids. Explore wave action. Encourage train and electric transportation. Most important: Hold to the existing urban growth boundaries for cities and towns; encourage infill.
• Thinking short-term, a few priorities emerge: (1) maintain and expand ODOT's flexible funds program. With modest investments to our bike and pedestrian infrastructure, we can impact how people travel and reduce GHG emissions; (2) maintain and expand home weatherization programs and credits; (3) expand the implementation of electric vehicle charging stations throughout Oregon; (4) increase the energy efficiency requirements for all new buildings - especially non-residential buildings.
• Carbon taxing (revenue neutral at first, then phased in further in the future); multi-modal transportation options (rail, public trans., cycling, ped)  
• Education and outreach - get people to understand the complications of their inaction and bad habits - coal reliance, excessive driving, sprawl, abuse of non-abundant resources, etc.  
• Maximize energy efficiency of cities; continue to maintain strong land use laws that discourage sprawl; increased efficiency of buildings, vehicles, transportation means and design.  
• Educate people about the challenges and opportunities; move to smaller homes grouped for energy efficiency  
• Strongly urge that each member of this commission and anyone involved with planning and decision-making read Lester Brown's (Earth Policy Institute) wonderful book: "Plan B 4.0" - especially last section "The Great Mobilization". To keep firmly in mind that climate change is very real and needs to be addressed with a degree of urgency. The preponderance of scientific evidence supports this, and the views of those amongst us who still don’t ‘get it’ should largely be discounted. Although glad we have ‘zero’ goals and are working towards meeting them, I would suggest that the goals are not adequate and based on info provided at this hearing, we are not currently on track to meet them unless we significantly intensify our efforts. The lowest hanging fruit still seems to be energy efficiency (in all areas) and conservation: after that, anything we can do to reduce reliance on carbon based fuels (esp. coal and fossil fuels) is critical.  
• Stop! The science has improved in the last decade and there are strong arguments and evidence that humans do not affect global climate in a measurable amount. There is no empirical data that proves AGW. There is, however, data that correlates with natural ocean and sun cycles. The state should immediately stop CO2 regulation until the science is better understood.  
• Educate! Talk about it! Facilitate town halls. This consumer drives change. The voters drive policy change to support a proactive response.  
• Get rid of ethanol in gasoline!! Cash or tax incentives for converting vehicles to propane. Knowing the speed of government, my ideal of 4 - 6 years or less, will take longer - just head in that direction sooner than later.  
• "Negative taxes for those who do good."  
• Incentivize energy efficient housing and transportation. Educate, educate, educate.  

Other Oregon  
Unknown zip codes  
(Total Feedback forms: 21)  

• Tax large cars and trucks and mileage so people would be responsible when it affects their wallet and budget. Change 1972 planning by Tom McCall to a new plan for 2011 and 2020. Educate people on future change.  
• Make individual energy consumption publicly available: utility bills, gas consumption, water use, material goods purchase - public - look up anyone’s footprint on the web.  
• Reduce growth! Sustain the status quo of the population and energy output, forget about growth potentials. Maintain an interconnection between all parts of city - trees, bike paths, parks with water collection ponds - keep the energy high in the center of the cities; no urban expansion w/o city centers retrofitted. City gardens to feed urban center. Neighborhood transportation systems with small bike/cars; use good land for food use, not private homes!  
• Make all buses free, or at least more affordable. Have better and more extensive bus system.
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- Invite citizens to participate in the process. Focus on communities, especially neighborhoods. Everyone needs to be invited to the table - all ages - children, school age, high school, intergeneration’s, families, elderly, etc.
- Ember/carbon costs in energy prices: broaden PUC authority to consider environmental impacts and to account for climate change related costs when calculating avoided cost rates for utilities.
- Missing piece: 50% of transportation emissions are rural travel, most of which are commutes to urban areas. Current land use/transportation planning regime is blind to this. Need action item to address extra-UGB urban-based travel and ODOT's facilitation of this unsustainable living situation.
- The state should address climate change in a way that respects individuals’ rights to make their own choices.
- Leadership: by example, by inspiring, informing & motivating Oregonians, by getting over the fear of talking truth. [did not answer any questions on survey]
- 1.) Stand firm on UGBs  2.) Promote rail transport/transit  3.) support transition to clean energy
- Shift taxing to change behavior
- Amend OAR 660-012-0060 (TPR) to allow urban density development inside UGBs. (Stop prioritizing auto travel in land use planning via TPR).
- Keep out of global warming business!
- Work on rational incentives, including smart grid.
- Prepare for the inevitable, because we, as a species, will not act to reduce our carbon, so the world will get warmer, and the weather weirder.
- Build financing models to set weatherization, infrastructure transmission lines up to scale - develop an energy infrastructure investment bank

The following section is organized by proposition and subquestion. The section presents aggregated input from Portland, Eugene, Bend and the other regions combined.

Include Climate in the Planning Process

Through careful planning, Oregon’s land use process enables us to manage growth while protecting the state’s natural values and livability. Can similar planning help us deal with greenhouse gas emissions and the likely effects of climate change?

1.1 How important is it that local community transportation and land use plans show how they are going to meet the State’s greenhouse gas (GHG) goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Hi 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 How important to you is it that the state rewards communities whose transportation and land use plans meet the State’s greenhouse gas (GHG) goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Hi 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.3 How important is it that larger electric and gas utilities are required to help meet the state’s GHG goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leverage the Energy Efficiency of Cities

Close to 70% of global greenhouse gas emissions come from our urban areas. By the same token, with their more compact form and efficient buildings and transportation systems, cities are where the greatest savings are possible. What are the best ways to capture these gains?

2.1 Retain the Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) in Oregon’s six largest urban areas as they now exist, focusing development and growth where they will support more efficient buildings and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Keep the UGBs as they currently exist, while allowing exceptions for new industrial facilities adjacent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- We need more industry to produce products and jobs.
- no exceptions
- in-fill eco-developments
- Build up, not out.
- No special exceptions to land use laws/[]
- But need to consider growing interest in urban agriculture and sometimes prioritize over industrial facilities.
- no expansion
- Yes - provided that stringent standards for efficiency are created and enforced.
- Keep UGB’s, no exceptions. The "model" for industry is obsolete and too big.
- Big box stores are not included, right?
- Comments
- Reuse unused industrial areas within the UGB.
- very few
- Leads to residential development outside the UGB
- Depending on type of industry - except defined "green" energy
- Don't know
• Don't know until I know many more details. This is a complex issue.
• Not on farmland
• Making exceptions as part of policy is fraught with difficulty
• Maintaining livability and community character and UGB [???] is important
• Soil conservation is a huge equity issue.
• There is room to build up, not out.
• Industrial redevelopment is as feasible and needed as other redevelopment
• Don't know
• Tough choice between economic development and environmental protection.
• Comments
• If we're talking about reducing pollution and emissions, shouldn't we also require industry to meet emission requirements too? (to make them more compatible with city)
• Need some new industrial facilities that may need large areas.
• Not sure
• difficult to say
• It's not the size of the UGB as much as what happens to it.
• Don't waste good agricultural land to buildings, especially toxic buildings.
• Depending on the industry, with strong guidelines.
• I need to know more about this before I can answer the question.
• No exception for industrial, jobs need to be where people are.

2.3 How important is it to you that cities be encouraged to plan and redevelop “20-minute” neighborhoods, where shopping, services, entertainment and access to transit are accessible by walking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leverage Efficiency of Buildings
Half the buildings that will exist in 2050 have yet to be constructed. New structures can be designed to be energy and carbon efficient or even carbon neutral. Existing buildings can be retrofitted to realize energy savings.

3.1 How important is it that we amend building codes to require new buildings to increase energy and carbon efficiency by at least 50% by 2030?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Solar roofs are another way to reduce emissions. On a scale of 1-9, do you favor incentives or regulations to install them on all new buildings?

Average response: 7.7

3.3 Electricity and natural gas are available to heat homes and businesses in much of Oregon. How important is it that we require building owners to select the most carbon-efficient fuel if costs (equipment and operating) are about the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>Hi 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative Transportation Fuels

Mobility is important to all Oregonians. Nearly 40% of total greenhouse gas emissions are related to transportation. How to preserve our transportation choices while decreasing vehicle emissions is the challenge.

4.1 What percentage of the time do you use the following types of transportation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 If you wanted to leave your car at home more often, what would need to change?

- I am fortunate that my employer strategically rents a space close to public transit and buys my transit pass.
- I don’t want to leave my car at home - I like it and I like driving
- Safe and continuous bike lanes in downtown Lake Oswego or at least marking for co-use. And I would need to get a new bike.
- more time, closer transit
- Where I live (tried to move but couldn’t sell home) (I drive a Prius)
- public transit
- The city needs to create eco-pod zones to become more effective.
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- fewer flat tires on my bike
- My kids need to get out of carseats or I need to get outfitted to take them by bicycle to child care.
- habits, life
- Regular bus service!!
- more frequent bus service to places I go
- We’d need to invent transporters, like in Star Trek.
- Safer roadways in some areas = more shared roads
- higher fuel cost
- More frequent buses - quiet, non-polluting buses, and an easy way to pay fares (i.e. debit card w/radio frequency reader?)
- Live in rural area - no bus. Bike lanes on the narrow rural roads with high-speed traffic, trucks with wide mirrors, etc.
- Bus shelters to get out of the rain, bus service on SE 148th and late night service.
- Car Home Change
- Keep bikes off the sidewalks so walkers are more safe.
- I don’t have a car.
- Nothing (no car) at age 75
- More accessible mass transit
- Don’t own a car
- Closer shopping
- Better weather
- Park and ride centers
- Better inter-city public transportation
- Better roads (major commuting roads in Eugene have potholes or are dangerous)
- Already bundle trips out with errands concertedly, getting out of the car within town.
- Flatter path to work; more frequent buses
- More public transit - I use auto mostly for long distances
- Move to a more central location - just did it!
- Private auto used very judiciously. Already leaving car at home several times a week.
- Schedule to find 1 - 2 hours per day vs. 20 minutes to travel from place to place around town.
- Bus schedule
- Bus available on weekends and/or where I live
- Safer biking routes - closer public transportation options
- Nothing. I don’t have a car, but if I did, make cycling and walking safer/easier.
- 20-minute neighborhoods; more van-bus routes
- closer bus-stops; I and many of my neighbors are 70+ years old
- better bus systems
- I live 20 miles out of town. A bus that runs 7 days a week out where I live.
- smaller buses more often, that allow companion animals (as they do in Europe)
- Better public transit - I live in a rural area (Roseburg)
- I live 7 miles from public transportation, 9 miles from shopping and other destinations such as banking and other services. A car-sharing system would help.
• I drive 13 - 14 miles to work one way. It would take me about an hour and a half to take
  the bus while I can drive to my work in 20 minutes. The cost in time is much greater
  than the actual cost of driving the car.
• Car Home Change
• More public transit
• I simply need to better organize my schedule and stop being lazy.
• Nothing. Car already lives mostly at home.
• I already do. Inclement weather and long distances are the only exceptions we use for
  driving.
• Easier and safer biking; more close-by retail
• How close I live to shopping, a greater availability of public transportation
• Nothing. I am without a car.
• To some extent the weather! Snow and ice make both walking and biking hazardous.
  More access to public transportation and more incentives to use it.
• More sunshine
• Where I live
• More bike lanes
• Where the children have their activities after school
• More intensive transit system. Our household is mobility challenged.
• Public transit - there really is not any here
• Proximity of services
• Car home change
• More frequent transit
• Ride bus or bicycle
• Better public transit featuring park and ride
• Better bike with a roof!
• Cheaper buses
• Better car-pooling sites for ride-sharing.
• Purchase a cart for my bike for transporting goods.
• Nothing
• Transit to other cities, coast, mountains
• Public transportation would need to extend to rural areas.
• Better public transit options for regional travel. Specifically from Portland to Eugene
  (cheaper too)
• Better bus service
• Stop working; job requires use of car at unpredictable and varying times; I carpool and
  drive far less than most Oregonians; (about 3000 miles/year)
• Move to the city - I live in rural America
• Easier public transit
• A lot
• Increased regional transit (Salem to PDX improved)
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4.3 How important is it that Oregon encourages electric and similar alternative fuel vehicles with incentives such as tax credits for buyers and subsidies for recharging stations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>High 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage but not req’d</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High 1-3 yrs</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 4-6 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Currently, our federal and state gas taxes support highway construction. How important is it that they also support public transit, and perhaps new inter-city high-speed rail service as well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>High 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High 1-3 yrs</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 4-6 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 How important is it that the federal government requires a doubling in the fuel efficiency for new vehicles by 2020, and invests in new low-carbon vehicle technologies like electric vehicles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>High 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Encourage but not req’d</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High 1-3 yrs</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 4-6 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replace Coal Emissions with Renewable Energy

Twenty-five percent of Oregon’s greenhouse gas emissions comes from conventional coal power plants; most of them deliver electricity into Oregon from out of state. Closing coal operations by 2020 at Oregon’s only in-state coal plant – PGE’s Boardman facility – will reduce coal’s contribution to Oregon’s greenhouse gas emissions by about 4% (to 21%)

5.1 How important is it that Oregon shift rapidly – e.g. by 2030 – away from conventional coal-generated electricity sources and toward more energy efficiency and both small and large scale renewable like wind and solar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1-3 yrs</th>
<th>High 4-6 yrs</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need More Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High 1-3 yrs</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 4-6 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Wind, solar and other new renewable technologies have higher up-front expenditures for capital costs, but lower fuel and operative costs over their lifetime. For many of these technologies, the higher front-end costs can be expected to drop over time, but there are no guarantees. On a scale of 1-5 (1 not willing; 5 very willing), how willing are you to pay somewhat higher power costs – possibly up to 10% higher – as a tradeoff to reduce carbon emissions?

Average response: 4.3

Comments:

• Keep the power supplies we have - go nuclear!
I favor a robust feed-in tariff to deploy renewables.
Supported by incentives for weatherization.
Already support green power at EWEB at 100% level.
As long as we can be guaranteed that excess $$ is going to renewable investment.
I think we already did this - optional %EWEB program.
But a substantial carbon tax would change this accounting.
These should be lower as time goes on (lower than present)
subsidize new renewable/do not subsidize fossil fuels
I am currently in EWEB’s green power program.
I’ll make sacrifices - use less energy as well.
My household and company both use 100% green power.
politically difficult sell
My only reservation is that I live on a low fixed income, otherwise this would be a "5".
The payoff needs to be in the 5 - 7 year range.
Already purchase BlueSky through Pacific Power.
Costs and efficiencies for solar are still improving rapidly.
already pay for BlueSky - Pacific
Reducing energy consumption costs less on a per kW basis.
already purchasing Big Sky electricity alternative
Already do
As long as we invest based on highest ROI first.
Not thrilled
Could utilities "Own" the improvements and we spread our pay over time?
Already have seen significant increase in my electric bills.

5.3 Many of these technologies will be more useful and cost less if we expand the high-voltage transmission system. This may raise issues with some households and communities or affect scenic or ecologically sensitive areas. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how much do you support expanding the transmission system, otherwise known as “the grid?”

Average response: 3.8

Comments:

Why?
If we are able to implement small scale distributed power and the smart grid, we may not have to build some of these high voltage transmission lines. Studies need to be funded to find out how feasible this is.
We need to reduce our electricity consumption by 90% then we may not need the grid any more.
Need a "smart grid" - and a good way to store energy from solar, wind and wave sources.
with appropriate safeguards for sensitive areas
I don't understand enough to answer.
More reliance on local networks.
no National Grid!
• We need smart grids. Should be able to do it without adverse impacts.
• OK - pushback. Can't we try to keep it more local and bury lines? I don't like ugly - let's try to remember, at least as a factor.
• Which scenic or ecologically sensitive areas?
• We can be judicious about this.
• localize power production
• search for more local energy generation methods
• This is the bottleneck/conundrum of renewable energy - how to get the electricity from outlying areas to the local center.
• Visuals don't bother me - protecting other species' habitats is VERY important.
• We cannot afford ecological damage. We need win-wins, not trade-offs.
• There might be some environmental compromise needed - there's no such thing as a free lunch.
• I need more information on this subject.
• It is a most painful trade-off.
• Make maximum use of existing grids - avoid environmentally sensitive areas where possible
• I think it's critical if we truly want to expand alternate electrical systems (solar and wind).
• Developing on-roof renewables, particularly solar-thermal and utilizing the energy where it's collected can help reduce loads required from the grid.
• Needs to be done without affecting health and safety.
• As an engineer whose school (MIT) is a fan of bigger grids, I still think it's a foolish path to follow.
• Let's XXX for energy we send out of state first.
• Assume you are talking about Direct Current HV systems - think with increasing reliance on wind power and large solar thermal - maybe necessary but should be carefully planned and alternative cars used when viable.
• Would smart grid be more appropriate?
• Again, needs to be considered for impact within specific regions
• The grid system is ancient and needs rebuilding.
• Bring transmission more local, e.g., PV's
• Ecologically sensitve areas need to be part of the picture.
• It's probably a necessary evil. It's too hard to do though (see OPUC docket UM1495 for example)
• Not the only choice. Distributed energy, energy efficiency much better choice (too much loss in transmission)
• receptive, particularly if it's for Oregon's use (not California)
• No - move away from expanding grid to making buildings create their own power.
• Improve existing grid; don't expand it. Renewable energy is a blight on the landscape.
• Depends on care for ecologically sensitive areas.

Capture Carbon from all Sources
Greenhouse gas emissions also come from growing food, manufacturing consumer goods, packaging, and transporting these good to consumers in Oregon.
6.1 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you that the state requires calculation of the estimated carbon that results from producing, shipping, selling, using and disposing the goods we buy and labeling the carbon content?

Average response: 4.0

Comments:

- Should NOT regulate!
- This could help with making US companies more competitive.
- We need to get serious about reducing the carbon footprint of consumer goods at all points along the production - transport - use - disposal - recycling spectrum.
- This is a key way to raise public awareness.
- Knowledge is power.
- Education will support good choices.
- Complicated
- I’d like to include information in my purchasing decision. I know it may be very expensive, so I’d use my wallet ($ vote) to choose any that voluntarily comply.
- Given information and a choice most consumers will choose least carbon options.
- Labeling is secondary to recording CO2 generation.
- Carbon tax
- Taking into account the usual life of a product
- Not sure this will have much traction with the larger population
- Need to know your starting point and impacts
- People need to make those connections
- Important but politically difficult
- Without taking this action, consumers will be ignorant of how they can make good choices to reduce CO2 emissions.
- Longer-term (6+ years). I’d like to see this system fully implemented. It will take some time, however, to develop a unified approach.
- assuming it is practical to do
- Publish same so that consumers understand what it means.
- Think it’s not always feasible, but is increasingly important to consider. Let’s begin with insane biofuel - ethanol. What a horrible idea that was!
- Good information, food for thought
- Buy local
- Too abstract at this time
- Important in the long run but low-hanging fruit = energy and transport
- Consumption based inventory shows "suff" is highest source of emissions.
- Not for food
- This will increase the cost of food and reduce jobs.

6.2 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 do not favor; 5 do favor), how much do you favor requiring the state to provide technical or financial assistance to industries that want to become more efficient?
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Average response: 3.9

Comments:

- I would rather see tariffs on foreign-made goods to offset the cost difference and pay for education.
- largely depends on ability of "industry" to help self
- Financial assistance would be great if it were by tax breaks, NOT subsidies.
- technical, mostly... fiscal will be limited.
- Germany has done so very well.
- How to finance this?
- Industries should help pay for such assistance.
- I am still concerned about the fragile state budget. No unfunded mandates, so how do we make it revenue-neutral?
- Helping with transitional costs is vitally important.
- What other ways are there... incentives, measuring and reporting, screening industry leaders for pro-environmental attitudes...
- Don't let it be abused.
- Not sure what "require" means...?
- carbon foot printing
- Efficiency should be our #1 priority.
- The state already has a number of programs, e.g. BETC
- I think the federal and state gov't should be funding R&D on efficiencies and other aspects of GHG research.
- Support small businesses and homeowners instead.
- More in form of providing technical assistance, but not opposed to financial also - dependent on particular industry.
- business needs to carry appropriate costs
- Information is power.
- The state is almost broke. Financial assistance comes from taxpayers, not the state.

6.3 Forests and soils sequester carbon by capturing it and holding it in place. One way to do this is to leave trees to grow, especially in older, established forests. On farms, it may mean growing crops using practices that are less disruptive to the soil. What methods, if any, do you favor to increase carbon sequestration? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Provide</th>
<th>Require</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider Effects of Carbon in Energy Prices

It’s tough to talk about putting a price on carbon when we’re still emerging from a recession. What are your thoughts about taxing carbon as a substitute for other taxes, so that our energy costs and our taxes could stay the same or even go down if we produced less carbon?
7.1 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you to replace the gasoline tax, on a revenue-neutral basis, with another approach whereby everyone pays for access to the transportation system, coupled with fees for the mils we drive and/or the fuel efficiency of our vehicles?

Average response: **3.7**

Comments:

- NO! Put taxes on the irreverent bike riders! Let's license bikes and charge fees to ride them.
- None of the items in question 7 are politically feasible and proposing them alienates.
- not sure
- This will quickly stratify the people into haves and have-nots.
- Need to make sure that people with low incomes are shielded from a disproportionate impact.
- This is called ecological tax reform - nothing new - do it!
- very important, but not at "revenue-neutral": we need a higher tax.
- Comments
  - mitigating impact on low income
  - I think the gas tax should be 50% of the price of gasoline, as it is in Eugene.
  - But need to increase public transport options coincidentally so there are alternatives
  - I need to know what proposed options are.
  - The gas tax should definitely be increased.
  - Public transport users should not be taxed further.
  - Don't know. Don't have enough info to make a wise decision. E.g., would this necessarily reduce gasoline use? If not, it may be a ruse.
- not clear - carbon tax is needed
- This needs to be phased in to not negatively affect low income people
- The gasoline tax should be INCREASED for those who use the most gas.
- This is a mixed message. Carbon price is one thing - mileage charges are the opposite!
- Unsure - it must be a combination of UMT and fuel efficiency to not penalize the latter.
- Although my car gets 37 mpg, a VMT tax would hurt me because I am a rural resident. I oppose taxes on cars that use alternative fuels or are high mileage.
- The transition to a VMT tax (or ??) needs to move forward.
- invasion of privacy.
- Not sure - I think gas taxes should be gradually increased to reflect and include the indirect costs associated with gasoline production and use. Increase offset by reductions in other taxes (income) that could be adjusted based on income - with lowest incomes receiving the highest benefit.
- more discussion needed
- Design more fuel-efficient engines. Nationalize the oil companies.
- But poor folks will be stuck with fuel inefficient cars in remote subdivisions.
- I think there needs to be a balance, not totally give up property tax.
- Depends on mix - oppose high access fees as benefits of transportation are coupled with costs through VMT tax.
- Need more info
- I already pay taxes in fuel - the more I drive, the more tax revenue they generate.
- I don't get how the fee for miles is better.
- It helped reduce smoking dramatically to raise cigarette tax.

7.2 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you to replace the property tax, on a revenue neutral basis, with a revenue source based on the size and operating (energy and carbon) efficiency of each building?

Average response: 3.4

Comments:

- Weird idea. Let's get rid of property tax and income tax and then have a sales tax.
- Not sure.
- This idea also penalizes those who can't afford the upgrades.
- How would it affect low/moderate income folks?
- Anything that could result in lower taxes should be considered.
- Interesting concept, but perhaps should replace ~50% of property tax, with existing assessment rate lowered.
- Not familiar with this concept.
- Penalizes the poor.
- Mitigating impact on low income.
- This is poorly proposed - social equity issues - property taxes are for schools and services, and cannot be re-aimed at this.
- If incentives, loans, breaks for low-income/renters
- I'm interested in this but worry about expiration as goals are reached. How do we balance the budget? Then bring back property taxes?
- Energy/carbon is not a sufficient basis for property tax - it could be a part of it.
- Don't have enough data upon which to base a wise decision. E.g., how much CO2 is required to create a more energy-efficient building?
- Not clear - carbon tax is needed.
- Perhaps there should also be incentives for carbon sequestration
- Energy consumption should be bottom line.
- Needs further discussion. Start with a split system.
- Unsure - difficult to achieve politically - perhaps for new buildings
- I support this only if low-income households are exempt.
- I think this might be impossible.

- Need both tax types.
- Have a much lower conservation property tax on undeveloped portions of properties larger than 5 - 10 acres. Property tax should not encourage subdivision and sale.
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- Partial replacement only - what objective should be is to encourage smaller, clustered living space.
- Interesting, but would need to understand details first.
- What about property size? Carbon sequester?
- Hard to implement - impacts on low income.
- Not sure. Will it change behavior, e.g. more efficiency? How does this compare with British Columbia’s income tax reduction program?
- Bad idea; impact on person living below poverty line = negative.
- Even if I had a very efficient house, which I do, I don't want this type of system.
- Need to think about this in terms of long-term revenue impact.

7.3 Taxes or fees on carbon use, depending on how they are designed, could affect low-income households disproportionately. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 not important; 5 very important), how important is it to you that such carbon pricing changes be accompanied by effective community programs to finance energy efficiency in the homes of low-income households, and improved access to public transit to provide affordable mobility to these households?

Average response: 4.4

Comments:

- We need cap and dividend!
- Nope. No "wealth redistribution".
- Maybe not just "finance" in the sense of low-interest loans. Think about grants and tax credits, too.
- Without equity measures, a democracy will not long support what many will see as "draconian" regulations/taxes.
- Replace wood burning in urban areas.
- The most vulnerable should be protected.
- The whole thing needs further discussion.
- Extremely important.
- Until we deal with helping low income households, our goals of reducing CO2 will be opposed by programs that advocate for low-income people.
- Social equity is very important.
- Taxes based on tiered level to income level.
- I believe energy efficiency and conservation should be available for, and increasingly required for, all buildings.
- always concern should be paid to affect on low-income households.
- There has to be some way to support lower-income options without vast extra paperwork and "low income programs" for some. Especially difficult with renters who can't always change energy decisions.
- Also, can use system like Earned Income Credit to compensate.
- This type of system should not be used.
- Plus mitigation for low-income i.e., raised EITC

7.4 On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 do not favor; 5 do favor), how much do you favor a national carbon
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tax or cap that would require everyone to share in the cost of reducing carbon emissions?

Average response: 4.2

Comments:

• If that tax was upstream and passed onto the consumer in the form of a dividend, I am all about it, but I don't think that is what you are asking.
• We need it right now.
• We need it now.
• Only as part of wholistic solution.
• No cap and trade.
• I favor a carbon tax but not cap and trade.
• need more info. I'm more comfortable talking locally. Are we talking about trading one tax for another?
• A cap would not be good. A tax on greenhouse gas emissions would be good.
• Don't know. Is this a distracting ruse? Why don't we simply gradually reduce our import and local mining of fossil fuels and let demand drive development of alternative fuels and fuel efficiency?
• Tax carbon production not subsidize it.
• Small sacrifices now rather than huge problems later.
• It is essential. In the meantime, we have much to do.
• Hard to pass politically.
• I wish we had the political will to do this. I have labored several years for this solution.
• New taxing schemes should be shared by everyone.
• Carbon tax has some merit but not so fond of current cap and trade programs. Like the idea of tax and subsidy shifting more.
• We already do.
• Federal level - National Grid! Regional inequalities (hydro, coal, gas) need to be accommodated fairly.
• It won't happen until we do it here, though.
• need more info.
• When will all other countries in the world follow suit? Only in America - we can't change the CO2 worldwide.
• With low-income mitigation.
Apollo Alliance
Oregon Global Warming Commission Public Workshop
Roadmap to 2020
Discussion Leader Guide
Thursday, June 16, 2011 7-8:30pm

6:15: Discussion Leader Overview/Training: Please arrive shortly before 6:15 and check in at the registration table. You will be directed to the area where Kirstin Greene will conduct the training. Identify one of the seven “Propositions” discussion topics you would like to host.

6:40 – 7:00 Prepare Your Table: Find your table; help with any setup still needed. Make sure you have an easel, flipchart, markers, and a table tent.

7 - 7:15: Welcome and Overview. Barbara Byrd (Apollo Alliance), Lisa Adatto (Climate Solutions), Jana Gastellum (OEC), Jenny Holmes (EMO/OIPL) will welcome participants, thank them for coming, and will introduce the subject and Oregon Global Warming Chair Angus Duncan.

7:15 – 7:35: Roadmap to 2020: Presentation. Angus will give an overview on the Roadmap, including a brief introduction to the seven Propositions. These are summarized in your/participants’ overview sheet, inserted in the comment form. As time allows, Angus will take 1-2 questions for clarification following the presentation.

7:35 – 7:45: Discussion Overview/Participants Find Tables of Their Choosing. Elizabeth Decker will help direct participants to form small groups for discussion. Participants will move to the discussion topic of their choosing. Tables will be marked with each of the seven Propositions. Add chairs to your table if there are additional participants that would like to join your topic, and/or create tables with new topics if there are a significant number of people who want to talk about a topic other than the themes presented. Large groups can be split into two if needed, depending on the number of discussion leaders and tables available.

7:45 – 8:15: Discussion. Welcome everyone. Introduce yourself; ask for introductions; and what brought people to the meeting this evening. Jot down responses if you can. We are interested in this.

Ask for a recorder or record yourself the key points of what people say on a flipchart.

Pick one of the ideas under the proposition heading on the overview handout, depending on your group’s interest.

Guide the discussion of the chosen idea to include considerations of:

- What are participants’ reactions to this idea generally?
- What would this look like for their family and community?
- How could this concept be implemented? What kinds of programs could be developed to achieve this goal? Who are logical and necessary partners?
- What benefits could it provide? Challenges?
- What changes would be needed at the individual, city, state and national level to make this possible?
Please ask one of the participants from your group to be prepared to give a brief report from your group.

**8:15 - 8:25: Quick Reports.** Elizabeth will help moderate a few select “best ideas” or questions from the floor.

**8:25 - 8:30: Next Steps.** Angus will give an overview of the next steps. Encourage participants to complete the feedback form and turn it in this evening.

**8:30 onward: Comment Forms and Wrap up for Discussion Leaders.** Although there isn’t much time built into the end, participants can complete comment forms before leaving if they have time. Please fill out your own comments as well! Stay with your group as needed as they finish the comment form. There will be a box to collect all the feedback forms at the registration desk. Please label your flipchart with your name, page numbers and date, and give them to Angus.

Thank you so very much!
Apollo Alliance
Oregon Global Warming Commission Public Workshop
Roadmap to 2020
Discussion Leader Tips

General Principles

Thank you for leading this discussion. Climate change can be an intimidating and overwhelming topic.

As a discussion leader, we want our participant group members to feel safe enough to discuss topics that may be difficult for them. Keeping the following tips and information in mind during the workshop may help understand some of the reactions and also to help move the group into more productive discussions.

Affirm the fact that this is a large and easily overwhelming issues; assure them that it is acceptable and encouraged for them to express whatever they feel on this topic: skepticism, passion, fear, solutions, etc etc. It is natural to hold simultaneous and sometimes conflicting feelings about climate change and its impact on our future: anxiety, guilt, fear, denial, hope and more.

Volunteering as a discussion leader is very valuable to the process; thank you again for helping host a discussion as Oregonians shape our collective response to climate change.

Please follow the agenda closely.

- Encourage creativity, questions.
- Affirm that this is a complicated subject; it is ok to have questions and concerns.
- Resist the temptation to express your own opinions or to be the “expert” on any subject.
- Record the key points of what participants are saying on the flip chart as part of the meeting record, or recruit a recorder from your group to write comments.
- Encourage everyone to participate but do not allow anyone to dominate.
- Keep the discussion moving by summarizing and synthesizing.
- Start and end on time.
- Have fun!

Specific Guidelines

- Emphasize that there are no “right” or “wrong” answers. Everyone’s opinion is valid. Summarize all on the flipchart.
- During the discussion, get a sense of the pace of the group; if necessary, wait momentarily for participants to catch up.
- Don’t be surprised if people are skeptical about climate change. That is ok. Record it. Redirect to how to respond if it is true, or some of the benefits Angus mentioned could come about through the effort of responding (more domestic energy production, green jobs, etc.), what should leaders on this issues be considering to shape our action strategy.
• Give credence to differences, but do not dwell on them. “It’s important that we have a frank discussion and everyone has a chance to speak.”
• Record everyone’s ideas; we are not striving for consensus.
• Do not hesitate to say you do not know the answer to a specific question. If it is pertinent to the discussion, raise your hand and ask for help, or record it as a question.
• Follow the agenda. “That’s a good question/idea/issue, but as you can see on the agenda, not quite what we’re discussing” or “We’re running out of time to talk about that now. Please be sure to write that concept/question on your feedback form.”
• Move the group along politely but firmly. “I see we have only a few minutes left.” or “Has everyone put down his/her ideas?”
• Summarize the discussion as you go along, confirming your understanding of what participants are saying.
• Relieve tension with movement (if you’ve been standing, sit down, or vice versa), or humor (directed at yourself only, please).
• Five minutes before the discussion time ends, briefly review everything the group has said. Make sure all ideas have been recorded. “Does anyone have anything to add?” Get someone to volunteer to summarize the group’s discussion for the full group.
• Enjoy yourself!

THANK YOU!!!
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3 What do you like about Oregon's weather?

low dew point compared to eastern U.S. low dry bulb temperature in summer compared to SW U.S.
You don't have to shovel rain! (We moved here from Illinois).
low humidity in the summer little ice and snow in the winter doesn't go below freezing too often
it does not stay the same for a long period of time
mild temperatures with plenty of rainfall
Summer is consistently very nice, and we don't see as many extreme weather events as other areas of the
country. It may rain 8 or 9 months out of the year, but it is never an overwhelming amount of precipitation at
any one time.
Four seasons. Mediterranean climate. Zone 8(ish). Variety of edibles grow well here. The diversity of climates
found within the state. The landscapes created by these different climates and their weather patterns.
I like the diversity, and the rain that helps things grow and prosper, our mild climate, though I do like snow and
playing in it. I love that it brings lots of water flowing in tumbling springs and rivers and provides a wealth of
diversity from east to west and north to south.
Sufficient precipitation for lush, green forests, greenswards. "Normally" sufficient sun in summer for gardening,
other outdoor activities--and low humidity!
temperate - not too hot, not too cold; summers that make life worth living...
It hardly ever snows, drops below 0 deg. C, and get above 33 deg C. I can wear a long sleeve shirt year around.
(It's a moderate climate)
it's mild - never too cold (not much ice and snow) or hot. Perfect for year-round cycling.
The seasons are very distinct. Spring is beautiful with all the flowering trees and abundance of growth. Summer's
are perfect (not to hot). Fall usually is crisp and clear with the colors changing. Winter is not my favorite, but
there is plenty to do inside.
Beautiful summers and mild, even if wet, winters.
I enjoy the summers!! Perfect temperature, blue skies!
I like the gentle rain and the dry summers... without the humidity. (I'm from Chicago). I like the occasional hard
downpour of rain and occasional snow. I USED to like the moderately hot summers. I like that my kids often
could go out on Halloween without a jacket.
Perfect Summers Moisture = Greenery/Scenery Mild winters
I like the variation and distinct seasons. I also like that it's relatively mild- winters aren't extremely harsh, we
don't have extreme humidity or wind, etc. Our weather-related natural disasters are also minimal.
I appreciate the fact that with rain we don't suffer from droughts. Food crops grow well here.
variety. no snow
Well, that depends on where or what part of Oregon you are asking about. Not all of the State of Oregon is the
same as the NW part of the state. I love the high dessert areas of oregon where it can snow for an hour and then
suddenly its sunny out.
The summer sunshine The winter - not too cold The rain - unless it goes until June as is is in 2011
the summers can't be beat. most of the time i like the rain.
I like that it is temperate and that plants grow so well here. We have a decent growing season and it's easy to
garden and get outside a lot. While it's wet, it's often not soaking and you can often still hike or bike without
getting too soaked
temperate climate generally with sunny summers
I love the nice days, because everyone comes outside to appreciate them. I endure the rain by making the most
of it sometimes(a hike in the rain is nice if you can get warm afterwards!) and at other times just spend time
indoors and appreciate that the rain keeps everything green and helps plants like luscious lady ferns stay green
and vibrant.
variety, temperate
the lushness the rain makes possible; the amazing summer weather pattern: warm/hot, dry daytime alternating
with cool, humid nights.
The sunny times. But I appreciate that the rain makes our state so lush, even if I don't enjoy biking in it!
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The beautiful sun in the late Spring, Summer, and early Fall!
I like the fact that there are clearly differences in the seasons. We have sun year round. The state also offers a lot of diversity in climate.

Generally mild all year round. Winters don't get too cold, summer not too hot. Not humid. There's a lot of rain, of course, but we couldn't have the lush greenery and abundant food production without it. This spring has been dreary, but overall the weather goes from fine to fantastic year-round.

Those rare days when it's dry, and moderate in temperature.

Cool springs, the changing cooling evenings of Autumn, not having to water our gardens until May, rain all winter to make everything soooo lush and green and give us ample stored water into summer.

The green lush environment the rains create. It's not too hot, nor too cold. I don't have to shovel snow in the winter, a large percentage of the time.

I love the gray and rain because it allows me to appreciate being cozy at home and to really appreciate the beautiful summers we have. I love seeing the leaves change color in the fall and the occasional snowfall in the winters.

Moderation. Rarely too cold & snowy in the winter. Never get stuck in the rain, never have to shovel it off the driveway just to get the car out. Rarely too hot and humid in the summer. Never have to hide indoors to avoid heat stroke doing yard work outside.

I like the relatively warm winters, and the long cloudy season makes summer that much more exciting.

Summer - I love the summers for the warm weather and sun, mixed with green scapes - lushness and life that the winter snow melts and rain provide. The extended rains make the summer farming delayed (At least these last 3 years for this novice farmer), but in general the summer feel abundant for growing food and for being out and about. I wish summer started in May then you wouldn't hear a peep from me. Fall - The rain, overcast, temperature and tree color changes are pleasant. Feels like a real transition from summer and it is not too rough for growing food. Winter and Spring - Mixed bag. I understand we need the rain if we want the lush green of the forests and if you want to grow food. Love the extended growing season, but the overcast the rain eventually drives me crazy. Two glorious weeks in February (usually) and spring flowers provide the UV and colors that help, but lately these wet and overcast Mays and Junearies are very difficult for me. They make me doubt my longterm plan for living in this region. Makes me wonder of the grass is greener else where, with out so much overcast. Moderate, there are no outrageous storms or extreme weather.

Generally mild, with sunny summers.

Relatively mild in the Willamette Valley.

Sunshine on the east side; always cools at night; the snow stays mostly in the mountains, yet we can see it or drive to it if we want to be near it; cool summers.

The frequent rain keeps the sky clear.

It is not extremely hot or extremely cold for long periods of time where I live. There is variety around the state - take a trip for a break!

The various seasons and what each one brings! Fall colors, warm summers, cold and exciting winter snows!

We have on of the most diverse offerings.

The preponderance of sunshine MOST years! I don't mind the snow as long as it's clear and sunny. I can't stand constant dreary days!

The nearly constant rain allows me to really appreciate sunny days.

Summer is glorious

I love the rain, I love the summers; what's not to like?

Uh...is this like a serious, government-sponsored survey? Seriously? I like dry, sunny days more than wet, rainy days. Is that hard to grasp? Do state employees need to be reading this? .

Barring silver thaw ice storms, the Westside climate is good for the trees and discourages immigration from southern states.

When it's sunny, it's beautiful. When it's nasty, there's nothing like a comfy chair in front of the picture window with a roaring fire in the fireplace.

I really enjoy that Oregon's climate has four distinct seasons. We generally get to enjoy snow in the Winter, a mild Fall and Spring and a very enjoyable Summer. Here in Oregon we escape most all natural disasters and get
to enjoy a generally pleasant climate. I wouldn't live anywhere else!
there's plenty of water, the summers are great! it's green and lush most of the year
No humidity, lots of rain makes everything green, beautiful summers that get just hot enough that you're excited
when it starts raining again.
summers, falls, crisp winter days
Mild weather supports good variety of food crops and not too expensive to keep comfortable. We get enough rain
that I don't worry so much about Oregon's future as about other places.
Because of the rain, the berries taste sweeter and the flowers look prettier.
Portland is temperate; it's not too cold. But you can still enjoy the snow on Mt. Hood, on demand. The
summers!!!!. The wind in the gorge makes Hood River a windsurfing Mecca. Salty air on the coast that is not too
cold, year round. Our weather makes for a green, abundant, and biologically productive habitat.
Relatively mild temperatures.
Like - some rain Dislike - months of rain Like - months of sun Like - mild (marine) climate of W. Oregon
I find the gray and rainy days to be relaxing. However, at some point I like to have seen the sun and enjoy the
long NW summers. I like that I can drive 1.5 hours in any direction from Portland and experience different
weather.... snow in the Mountains, the sun and dryness of eastern Oregon, the wind and wetness of the coast.
Well, that's complicated, since there are so many ecozones. I love living in Portland/the Willamette valley
because I prefer mild temps and (generally) lower humidity; I can't stand hot, humid, muggy weather. I like not
shoveling snow, and knowing that I can get to snow when I want to. I love the rain that makes everything green
and does all the other wonders it does. I love it that I can take wintertime sunshine breaks by simply heading
over to Hood River and east, and summertime cool-down breaks at the coast after long hot spells in the city.
lush beauty, mild winters
- random bright sunny days in the middle of January and February downpours - spring showers and sunbreaks -
warm but not too hot summers
We live in a rainforest and everything is green, and the weather is mild.
The Sun!!!!!!!
The fascinating range of weather conditions throughout the year and across the state supports an amazing range
of ecosystems. The interaction of weather and geology results in interesting geographic patterns of precipitation
and temperature.
Even when it wet for a lot of days, there's usually breaks of sun. The rain makes it very green! I like that
Oregonians know how to live in the rain. There's lots of gear available to keep you dry and no one looks at you
funny if you arrive a little damp. I enjoy the fact that it can be rainy in Portland and usually you can drive to the
sun or snow in a very short time.
short winter days
Not too hot or too cold
Mildness, fecundity, greenness, variety.
It is generally mild with only occasional extremes (ice storm or heat in excess of 100 degrees).
Temperate summers, range of weather (eg hot on the east side, cool in the mountains and the coast), the
occasional winter storm in Portland.
The summer weather is perfect! Blue skies, cool breezes, warm days and cool nights. I also love when fall comes
after the hot end of summer - the first cool, drizzly day feel so refreshing and comforting.
That there are so many green plants and trees, year-round. The rain is refreshing, if a bit long. The summers are
gorgeous. The temperature is good.
Sunny summers, temperate winters. I can ride my bike all year long.
It's not too hot.
sunny summers. The rain is tough sometimes, but it makes everything so green, so I put up with it.
Overall, it's variety--and that it's mostly clement. While we have occasional hurricanes, tornadoes, lightning
storms, and blizzards--they occur relatively infrequently, and usually at intensities low enough to not be
threatening. On the other hand, in some sense, we have it all--coastal rains and storms, Mediterranean summers
in our western valleys, snow in the mountains (where it belongs--meaning in western Oregon winters I can
luxuriate in not having to shovel my driveway free of rain), the sage-scented rain shadow of eastern Oregon, and
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glorious outliers like balmy Brookings or antarctic Seneca.
I like the variety; I like the rain and grey skies and I like that it keeps so much of the landscape verdant. I grew
up on the coast and in one day you can have rain, sunshine, breezes and fog.
I love that there is always green foliage and practically perfect trees. I don't like all the rain
the change in the seasons the difference in the rain at different times of year the faboulous summers
The rain, the sun..somewhat predictable seasons.
very mild
It's fairly mild, wet enough to produce a green Willamette Valley, and diverse enough to ooridcy productive,
beautiful, and in some cases, pristine environments.
It's generally mild and temperate in Western Oregon. Particularly, I like the fact that it is green. I am shocked
when I travel elsewhere and find it brown there.
I moved here from Austin TX to get away from miserably long, hot summers that dragged on forever with no
rain, and then when the rain did come, it was in flood-stage levels. Portland weather is wonderful, rain and all.
Rare ice & snow, very rarely too hot or too cold for bicycling (with appropriate
gear).
the water that makes everything green.

There are many climates in Oregon. It ranges from the rainy coast to the mild Willamette Valley to the dry high
desert. Precipitation means water, water means salmon and streams and snow in the mountains. The variety of
climes offers diversity of our natural resource base, from the fast growing Doug-fir on the westside and the
slow growing Ponderosa Pine on the eastside of the Cascades. Global climate change would drastically alter the
opportunities to make a living both for humans and organisms that provide for our economy through consumption
and tourism. Climate change will mean chaotic weather patterns as a constant influx of heat will not allow a
stable climatic pattern to become established. Our state is largely agricultural and natural resource dependent.
We will suffer.

warm, dry summers beautiful fall weather winter snow in the mountains spring in the eastern Columbia Gorge
the summer, and the not too cold winters
There being 4 distinct seasons. Even if sometimes the season comes later than we want it to.
Originally form the East Coast, I love the reversal of pattern here -- the landscape is green and lush in the winter
and brown and dry in our short summer.
The mild temperatures....and, beautiful summers!
The rain is refreshing, the weather is mild and my favorite color is green. (southern willamette valley).
I like that there generally are not extremes. We do not have extreme heat waves, extreme bouts of cold weater,
etc. Also, we do not have hurricanes, tornadoes, etc.
I enjoy the four seasons, more distinct when we travel northeast of our coastal home.
I don't mind the rain too much because it keeps us so lush and green. I do not enjoy the snow and ice in winter
because of driving, and I do not enjoy the week or two of really hot weather in the summer. I LOVE the fall, the
crisp air and the golden light that we see in late September and most of October are the best.
The summers! And snow in the mountains.
I love the moderate temperatures. Maybe a bit too much rain, but it does result in some beautiful surroundings.
Love the cloudy skies with sun breaks!

Mediterranean climate
Mild winters and relatively mild summers (NOT humid) and lovely falls and springs (usually).
low humidity, seasonal changes, generally moderate, summers are fantastic but lately summer weather has
started later and later in the year.
I love how mild it is and I am able to have beautiful plants without effort.
The variety.
Seasons are generally mild. Can go to the snow if I want to, but not live in it all the time.
Lack of extremes of heat and cold. Long Spring. Variability

Cool; rain that makes the foliage green...I love evergreens. I cannot bear temperatures over 70 degrees. I left
So. Calif. because my ideal was the Pacific Northwest where its forests met the sea.
Bright sunny skys most of the time and the lack of temperature extremes.
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That neither winter nor summer weather is extreme. That it produces tall trees and lush foliage. That it inspires lavish public and private gardens. (but of course this year I've complained as much as anyone else)

I like definite seasons; variety. I don't like being too hot; like the greeness.

I love the sun in Eastern Oregon summers and the warm summer rain showers. I love the sagebrush that is a result of the EO climate! I love how it is rarely - if ever - humid. I love the beauty and sound of thunderstorms that won't result in tornadoes. I love how beautiful the rain makes the west side of the state (though I don't really enjoy actually living in it.)

Summers are warm and sunny. All the rain keeps things green. Its never humid. We don't have much "extreme" weather like hurricanes, tornadoes, etc.

The weather is different throughout the state but, in general, I like the mild climate.

There are definite seasons.

Cold, wet, cloudy

Dry summers and mild winters.

The seasonality, the way the rain keeps us green and clean.

Such diversity across the state! Green lushness in the fertile west, healthy fire season in the high country.

That it's not insanely cold in the winter, that summers are warm, but not so hot and humid as to make an indoor activity preferable, that all the annoying rain keeps everything so green, in other words, that one can continue outdoor lifestyle most of the year

It allows beautiful things to grow year round and supports a diversity of natural places.

The long sunny days in the middle of somewhere and the thick snow in winter - perfect for outdoor recreation!

The lack of the high humidity that is present in other parts of the US, as well as a moderate climate that isn't too hot or too cold.

I have lived in Oregon, Washington, and in the Chicago area. In my opinion Oregon's weather (particularly Western Oregon) is the best kept secret in the country! Winters are not very cold compared to other parts of the country, and summers are not too hot and humid compared to other parts of the country.

That it is varied around the state and you can find the weather that suits you. I also love the cooling effect the Pacific usually has on coastal summer temperatures. I love the stormy, rainy winters. I am not a fan of hot and humid or freezing and dry, so the Oregon coast is perfect for me.

Here on the western side and coastal range I love the rain that gets things green. I love the sun that is as much available to grow the greens and give energy as any other area around. (almost) I love the eastern side weather for its dryness. we get the best of both worlds here in Oregon. Oh and did i forget to mention the great fishing and hunting and camping. Without this diverse weather it would be quite boring.

We do have moisture and water, which is very important. Regularly, I say how lucky we are in the NW. Yes, we have rain. However, we don't have hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes or volcanoes (usually) and not too much flooding. Right now, NW feels like a safer place to be.

Lovely, not too much ice

That we actually have weather and seasons. Snow and the sun.

The variety. And the wet winters that keep Californians away.

Winter rain in the valley brings deep mountain snows- water for skiing, fish and farmers. Most springs are a mix of sun and showers, and summers dry and rarely too hot. Fall is always welcome as a respite from the dry heat. It varies.

The rain makes things grow, we have fresh clean water, not like most of the world. Sure I get a little tired of the rain like we had this year but that is weather it has patterns usually 4 seasons moderate temperatures

It's not death valley

I like that we have distinct (usually) seasons, my favorite of which is high summer. I appreciate that we do not have drenching humidity in the summer, and that we have mild winters, and while the rain drives me nuts come spring, that we are better situated for water supply than many places.
Appendix N: Survey - Responses to Open Ended Questions

The mild summer days in the Willamette Valley. I do appreciate the rain because of its benefits on our flora. I also love snow in the Cascades.

rain, rain, rain :) and nice summers, not so hot most of the years, w cool nights easy winters late summers, all the way into October sometimes

It rarely snows in the Willamette Valley. Often we have fresh crisp days.

rain, distinct seasons, lovely spring and fall

Mild, variable, very few tornados

The sunshine in the summer, and even the rain as it leads to all the green.

Mild weather, gorgeous summers. Although the rain can be a little too much at times, the abundance of water is a precious asset.

Beautiful summers and autumns, variety of climates (can usually drive a couple hours and get out of the heat/rain at home), generally mild temperatures

All four seasons can be experienced relatively easily from the Willamette Valley.

The predominance of cool and wet weather makes much of our state a virtual rainforest that is lush and verdant. Unlike California, our city streets regularly get washed clean by the rain on a regular basis. So far we have enough water to keep our flora, fauna and humans happy and healthy.

Summers: Warm days and cool nights, sunshine Winters: snow in the mountains Coastal storms Rains bringing lush greenery to the coast and west side. Arid high desert sunshine on the east side.

long dry summers heavy rains actually rare but light rains common, generally mild winters easy escape to different weather (beach, mountains, near deserts) uncommon extreme events like tornados, lightning, flooding

It supports life as well as any place on the planet or better.

gentle rain and fog, sun especially after long periods of rain

Lots of green growing things! Lots of trees. Lots of spring flowers. Rarely very cold, and usually not extremely hot. Many different regions--coast, coast range, valley (s), cascades, high desert. Rarely extreme storms (away from the coast).

Its generally moderate. We only get a few weeks of freezing snowy days in the winter and a few weeks of hot humid weather in the summer.

variations

Temperature mild both summer and winter

Sometimes exciting; sometimes dull. Delightfully unpredictable.

I like the temperate climate--the warm but comfortable summers followed by fall, then the rainy season with all the varying shades of color provided by the cloud cover, evergreens, hills and mountains. I also like that when I'm tired of rain I can go skiing on the sunnier east side or head to the coast to catch the 'pineapple express'. plenty of precipitation, mild winters, and a warm summer in W.OR., Great for primary production! Cold dry climate in E. OR. that yields a diversity of ecosystems and wildlife

Its richness and the rainforest feel it gives. The summers are beautiful, and winters are not all that tough to live through.

Not severe. Not too hot, not too cold. everything

I like that fact that I live in a place where there are not too many climate extremes. I have very low Vitamin D levels, though, even after taking super supplements, so I try to escape to warmer, sunnier climes, when possible. (It's still too low, my doctor has informed me.) I wish we had more sunshine. The last two years have been especially difficult with our soggy, gray winters and our very wet, gray springs. I wonder why all the changes????

Unfortunately, I believe I have a very good idea.....eeeek! Go 350!

The pleasant summer weather.

Seasons are good. Change is what makes the world go round.

I am a Portland native and I have always loved the mild summer weather. We get some HOT days yet generally they are comfortable.

I love the rain and the short summers

More temperate climate than most of the nation
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Variety / seasons / moderation mostly but access to extremes if desired -- surf to alpine wilderness
You have 4 seasons, usually, and there are so many different weather occurrences. Snow, sunny, warm.
It's seasonal and in western Oregon, it is so very green and vegetative!
I come from Montana, so I love how winter is not really 'winter' ... and it doesn't get too disgustingly hot in the summers either.
There is enough rain in western Oregon to keep the land lush and to allow for pretty good water supply in many areas. I like that harsh freezing temperatures are rare, and that we have sun in the summer.

definite change of seasons, great for gardening
The area I live in has more sunshine then the rest of the state. The Willamette Valley I find depressing. It's too wet and dreary. I grow lovely flowers where I live and many fruit trees; and a garden which I harvest and preserve. We usually get less then a foot of rain here, but by April or May it's about done until November or December. I really don't believe in Global warming. This old earth has gone through many cycles and it's been warming since the last ice age. I really preper the heat to a glacier a mile thick where I live.
Low humidity, temperate summers, little snow or ice at lower levels where I live. 12-month bicycling season.
changing seasons; moderate temperatures
What is to like? The climate is just that. Maybe the weather guys at the various TV newcasts are getting a little better at predicting when it will rain or shine, but I do not believe that we need to try to control it. Work on something useful like seeding the clouds above a tornado to make it release some of its tempest. --or is that being blamed on global warming. A lot of money is being wasted on methods any normal person could see would fail. Wind power--the noise and vibration is awful and what is it doing to the wild animals and birds? Solar power, we will never live long enough to amortize its cost. Corn fuel--the reason we have so many people starving, because farmers are diverting food growth for subsidies for growing the "alternative" fuel that ruins expensive car engines. What will they/you (?) think of next?
Well that depends where you live in Portland we don't get much snow which can be nice, sometimes like this year it was too much rain, but for the most part its fine. I'm a native Oregon, so it is what it is. Besides how else do you get all the pretty trees and flowers
I love it all, I just wish the rainy season was a month or 2 shorter.

the variety
The lush green foliage it provides and the modest temperatures.
Not to cold or to hot
the defined seasons
In a single word- DIVERSITY If one lives in Eastern Oregon, it is generally dry , arid and moderate. If one lives in Sun River, there you will live at higher elevation and experience a winter, mountainous weather pattern. If one lives near the Coast, then it can be rainy and lush...... Each region has its own distinctive weather pattern and habitat.
Relatively mild in the Willamette Valley. Summers are awesome. Easy to enjoy a different climate by traveling east or west. Love the seasons.
Moderate climate with occasional outliers--very hot or cold spells. Lots of variety--no one weather pattern sticks around too long. Okay, so maybe a bit less gloom in the spring would be welcome.
I love the rain, the plants the seasons
The Summers are really nice. When it finally does get warm and sunny, it is highly appreciated. I like how we get even warmer than other west coast cities that are right next to the ocean, yet we are only an hour from the beaches.

Clouds
Not too humid in the summer and not freezing in the winter.
sunshine in Klamath County - storms at the coast
The weather has emotional connections for me because as a child I used to visit my auntie here and I loved her very much. Thankfully, she didn't live in the Sahara!
The lack of extremes tops my list.
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rain snow sunshine
Less rain than southeast Alaska!
mild
I like the rain but not endlessly. Too much of a good thing, you know.... I like that we have seasons thanks to the weather.
the changing seasons. the variety
Mild climate, few wind events
As a Washington County, Oregon native, I have acclimated to all forms of Oregon's weather. To describe rain, I have coined the phrase "Life-giving moisture falling for free from the sky." Each season flows along "sensibly" and moves into the next, usually establishing a clear statement of each season without going overboard on any of them. I love the gentleness of Oregon/Willamette/Tualatin Valley weather relative to the rest of the world. I like no monstrous bugs, no tornadoes or hurricanes, reasonable humidity and the delicious maritime influence of the Pacific Ocean.
It is not to hot and humid and it doesn't get real cold, at least where I live.
Not too hot, not too cold. Like most States though, if you want more of one than the other, it's only a road trip away.
Perfect
That's a dumb question. Oregon has many different climates and weather zones. If you're asking what I like about the specific Oregon climate in which I live (high desert - Bend)... I like the dry air, the mild winters, cool summer nights
Not too hot, not too cool
It is just fine like it is. Mother Nature will run its course no matter what humans do.
we have four distinct seasons
Just wait awhile and it will change.
it's dry
We really appreciate the days when we have sun in our eyes.
We have great seasons
It is moderate
It's mild: not too hot and not too cold.
relatively moderate, little extreme in temperature
Mostly sunny where I live, but I feel concerned about recent changes and the prospect of climate change, especially if we don't start making changes.
The sunshine and dry heat.
The 4 definite seasons
variety
The diversity from the mostly rainy coast to the desert
The extremes generally stay in the proper places - accessible but not dominating.
It is temperate in the Valley, colder in the east, and allows one to enjoy a variety of climate experiences. No humidity, no bugs.....a great place to live.
Warm summers filled with sunshine. Long growing season, temperate coastal weather
The diversity!
Change of seasons... ya never know what it will do next
Clean and green, mild, and cool. Generally not stormy. Warm, non-humid summers. Moderate winter temperatures, with no need to shovel snow, or drive on snow and ice.
Temperate, lots of sun, no tornadoes or hurricanes.
Close to but not quite like Missouri weather.
I live east of the cascades where most of the weather occurs. I like 4 seasons. I love the winter and its challenges and recreational benefits.
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The changing seasons as well as the warm summers and mild fall weather.
Not very extreme compared to other parts of the US.
Lack of temperature extremes.
Summer, fall and winter; not spring
No hurricanes
Warm summers and cold winters here in Bend. Short spring (most of the time).
four seasons
How frequently it changes
Bend specifically: Sun. When it gets hot in summer it cools down at night. I've lived in wet environments like the valley and can tolerate the extended gray periods better than some people.
Moderate overall
Variety
The cold wet winters, the cool summers, and the dry fall.
the four different seasons although winter is the best.
all of it
The variety. Things change continuously. If you don't like the weather now, wait an hour.
THE DIFFERENT SEASONS
Moderate temperatures and especially when it is sunny!
Summers and falls here are fantastic; springs and winters not so much. I don't mind the snow but the driving conditions can be treacherous, especially the black ice. I wish that it wasn't quite so dry but that is the price to be paid for living in the high desert. Rain is good and necessary so I don't complain about that but the cold rain we have been experiencing this spring has gotten old.
In Central Oregon, I LOVE the snow and the sun. We can go out almost every day without concern for the ever present rain on the West side of the state. However, because of that rain, the West side is very green and lush I
Dry climate east of the Cascades
The warm, sunny days. The clean, fresh air. All makes waiting worth it for me!
Which part of Oregon? I love Western Oregon summers and autumns, Eastern Oregon springs, Southern Oregon winters, Coastal Oregon on any sunny day...
LOVE the snow here in Bend!
It is temperate - not too hot and not too cold The rain keeps the air clean and the countryside green, not brown as in many states.
It cools down at night
I live on the Oregon Coast and we generally do not experience either extreme heat or cold.
I live in Bend and love the sunshine. Just moved here from Spokane
The clean air and sunshine no matter what season it is.
The variety in the seasons. The long Indian Summer we have on the East side of the mountains. BTW There are several different climate regions in our state so it is a mis-nomer to generalize it as "Oregon's weather".
seasons
varied and dynamic
low humidity
Central Oregon has distinctive seasons. It's usually dry and blue skies.

Love the hot summer, the warm fall, but have found that the winter lately seems to be lasting much longer, and the spring is falling into summer. Summer lately has seems short, our family feels sad about this.
we actually have 4 seasons. I have been here 32 years and have seen alot of weather change but if you look back about 15 yrs this is the same weather patterns we used to have. I love the warm summers cool springs beautiful autums and the cold and sometimes harsh winters great for sleding.
four seasons
sunshine and warm weather
not super hot or cold
love all the seasons - high desert is great
It is mild comparatively speaking.
Mixture of wet/dry periods, warm/cold, and generally moderate overall. Lack of extremes which plague other areas of the world.
We have all four seasons. We have adequate water from adequate precipitation.
Variety of seasons and weather experiences.
I like the changing seasons with all the colors of leaves and various flowers and trees blooming throughout the spring and summer. I love to see all the different wildlife at various stages of development throughout the year. I like the snow nearby at Mt Bachelor for snow sports and even enjoy all the types of snow we see in town. I like the fresh air and clean water. I love the beautiful skies especially during sunsets. I love the warm, dry air in Central Oregon during the summer that rarely gets too hot to be uncomfortable.
calm and clean for the most part.
genesis mild climate
Diversity. In Oregon, one can find just about any climate one wishes to experience. If one type doesn't fit, there are alternatives.
moderate
Seasonal variety.
Plentiful rain in Portland results in a very lush, green environment.
It is variable
Oregon has many diverse micro climates if you get tired of one you can easily visit another. Climate diversity is, in my view very important to long term enjoyment. Everything gets old with time and the ability to enjoy diverse climates insures climatic contentment.
The green landscape.
There are seasons.
Rain
The seasons. The way the rain makes things green. The way the rain cleans the air. The range of temperatures.
I like that it is varied in different parts of the state. One can't really characterized Oregon's weather as any one kind. Weather changes almost daily and from place to place within the state.
We enjoy the beautiful Mid summer through early winter, the crisp mornings and warm afternoons are beautiful.
We have so many micro climates in Oregon to enjoy.
The changes from summer to winter and back again
Different cyclical seasons.
It varies for the east to the west side of the state
Nice change of season, hot and cold.
Variety. Lots of rain & snow to fill the rivers and reservoirs and lots of hot, dry summer weather.
love winter snow on the eastside
Beautiful, sunny summers with low humidity. Generally mild winters. Even though it's rainy, it's not as cold as many other places.
I love the fine season between May and late October. In Portland, it seldom gets very humid, and there aren't swarms of mosquitos and biting bugs. I do not miss the harsh winters i knew as a boy in upstate New York. extreme variation from coast to high desert
This question is silly. The weather is something one deals with.
I moved here for the snow. I soon realized that I love the drier climate. And, the summers in Bend are absolutely perfect!!!
Sunshine - when there's no wind
The variety in Central Oregon.
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Dry, warm summers with cool nights. Cool, wet winters that generally do not get very cold.
lack of significant snowfall in Redmond area; dry climate
It is varied, from freezing and snow to warm but not too hot summers. We have seasons, and the corresponding flora and fauna.
Plenty of moisture. I like having a real winter on the east side of the Cascades.
Not too hot, not too cold, lots of green, not too much wind
It has variety - never boring! In Central OR, where I live, it is usually beautiful. I also like the temperature variation - 50 degrees is not uncommon.
Very low humidity. Great summer weather for hiking and camping. Doesn't go into the negatives often.
the fact that it makes everything green 365 days/year
Snow in winter. Sun in Summer. Moderate - never too hot or too cold for too long.
4 distinct seasons, no hurricanes or major tornadoes.
It is continually changing. We are dominated by our location and influence to the Pacific Ocean. We do have four seasons albeit some are shorter or conversely longer than the rest of the nations!
Rain, cool and dry at different seasons throughout the year
It’s variability. Why are you asking this question in a survey about global climate change. This is a touchy feely non quantitative question.
that it is mild
It’s 4 mild seasons compared to other places of America and the world.
Not too cold. Not too hot. Not humid. Fall and summer are wonderful
The variability both in my own area, Central Oregon, and that I can easily drive to another climate zone when in the Valley and Coast when I am sick of winter here.
where I live, there is usually plenty of water
Oregon’s weather -- there’s a lot of Oregon with a lot of different weather. I come the upper Midwest (Wisconsin) and now I divide my time between Eugene and Deadwood, in the Coast Range. I prefer the mild rainy winters to the long gray cold winters of WI and I prefer the mild, dry summers to the humid, mosquito-ridden summer days of WI. I like the way Spring-like weather begins in my part of Oregon in late February and continues to July.
Living in Central OR and thus avoiding all the valley rain (where I was raised) is great. I am a person who is mostly too warm so 9 months of winter are good and I love the winter activities. It’s great to be active year round.
adfads
Almost no blizzards-ice-snow.
I like the sun breaks, I like the clowds, I like the rain! Fall is my favorite season. I like the fact that Oregon has a very strong water cycle which means that water is a plentiful and important resource for our ecosystems.
It’s mild of all seasons. It’s not really as much rain as Seattle and we don’t have monsoons. The rain is really beautiful if you’re able to appreciate it from a window and not stuck in it. When it pours, just wait five minutes and it will clear up and you can go outside. As the weather changes and it gets sunny, people are SO HAPPY. You walk down the street and people are smiling and nice to each other. We appreciate it all the more since we’ve done without. The evenings are still cool and there is usually only a few days of unbearable heat and then it’s back to normal - nothing like other regions. The snow is funny. I love that everything shuts down at the mere chance of snow. It’s nothing like the East coast. We don’t have as many colors as some areas with the trees that change in the fall but we also don’t usually have to turn on our heaters until late October.
Unexpected sunny days in the early spring or late fall. I also like that the temperature consistently drops at night, kind of like a reset button. My favorite Oregon weather is the hot summer.
Generally mild weather. Not too hot in the summer and not too cold in the winter. And plenty of liquid sunshine to keep everything green and fresh.
It never gets too cold or too hot to go out and get around. Don’t need an air conditioner.
I love the rain so I fit in very well. I miss thunderstorms and the summers are too hot for me most of the time. A little rain in the summer would be nice.
The incredible green of the forests, the lush plant growth in spring and the gentle rainfall that keeps the air clean
of pollens. The diversity of climates across the state keeps it interesting.
Cool, refreshing, and invigorating; never excessively hot.
1. The seasonal variety: you can’t fully appreciate a warm, dry summer unless you’ve been through a cold, wet winter. 2. The abundance of water manifested in our rivers, lakes and sea, which of course depends on -- ugh -- rain. 3. The moderate temperatures
I like the mix of definite seasons, the shifts and transitions, and can go with the flow.
Green plants it produces. 4 seasons. Snow nearby my city. Moist air.
Mild. Mostly cool, not hot. Though I’m not a fan of continual overcast, I appreciate that we have rain and water. Variety. There are definite seasons. It’s always comfortable.
The diversity of it all. Always changing.
Mostly moderate temperatures, rain helps with the green-ness and plant health but there are some absolutely beautiful stretches in most springs and summers.
change in seasons (usually)
I like the moderate temperatures and all the rain that keeps a green environment.
It has 4 distinct and wonderful seasons!
There is enough rain to keep some many areas green and beautiful.
The rain that makes everything green, and the incredible summers we have.
It is not extreme
I love that it does have seasons here, even though the cold, wet one trumps in length, the warm one is SO beautiful.
summers not too hot, when the sun shines, it’s incredibly gorgeous.
Seasons
It’s never boring. I do not do well in HOT climates, so the cooler temps of Central Oregon for most of the year suits me just fine!
it’s in Oregon! Not too anything.
It’s not too cold in the winter; and its nice and warm in the summer and its a little wet in between which makes everything green.
I like that the hot weather does not last long.
Its generally warm even when it rains
Springs and Autumns that Burst with Color!! Summers are Winters Distinctive and Adventuresome!! There is a Rhythm to the year...
Warm summer and some in spring and fall. There is actual winter snow, but not too much. Clouds beautiful, rain not that bad but greyness does become a tad wearing.
It is the best variety!!
mild temps on west side
Its moderation and that the amount of rain makes for a literally green state---in the western part, anyway.
The seasonal changes
The rain does keep it green, and at least you don’t have to shovel it. What I like is that usually I never have to wear a coat. And most important, it isn’t usually really hot and humid.
Sunny
I live in eastern oregon and the SUN is great.
Lack of snow in the valleys. Mild winters and summers - not too hot or too cold very often.
I like the all-year greenness. The amount of rain we get allows us to have a green summer. I grew up in Texas, where it’s green for a little while in the spring and then brown the rest of the year. I also love the mild summers, which allows me to not need air conditioning in my house. In fact, we have lived here 15 years without air conditioning. And the winters are not too severe, either. I’ll take rain over bitter cold any winter day.
I feel best with a light or heavy cloud cover; it’s like a blanket over the sky keeping me warm and cozy. Rain is
nice to though especially if I'm warm in bed or walking with a good pair of boots. I appreciate the wet partly bc I'm a native and have webbed toes, but also because it's what makes life GREEN here. I love the green. I'm like that moss that almost sparkles when it mists. I hate being dehydrated!!!! Summer is sometimes a bit relentlessly sunny for me here.

I love that the air gets cleansed regularly by the rain. I love the warm days and cool nights. I enjoy the uniqueness of each season. The plants, the colors, the wildlife I see around my house and in the wild places nearby.

Portland's weather rarely stops me from doing what I want to accomplish. It generally is gentle weather. Best of all, it leaves much of our state looking lovely in green!

It's mostly moderate, with interesting extremes.

Everything is almost always green. That's because of the rain. Rainy season is long but without it not so much green.

I love the long spring, summer and fall; even winter is not too bad most years. I can't handle harsh winter weather or superhot & humid summers. Oregon summers are so beautiful I never want to leave the state for a vacation trip.

lack of humidity

\[ n = 376 \]

4 What don't you like about Oregon's weather?

I don’t like the fact that it rains so much, but that can’t be avoided.

My house is not sufficiently insulated or lighted naturally. I am probably affected by seasonal mood challenge. the rain and darkness

I'd prefer a sunnier and warmer climate, although I appreciate all the green vegetation.

I need a little more sunshine in my life sometimes rainy

It is too damn wet!

What I don't like about the Willamette Valley's weather is the interminable rain. What I don't like about eastern Oregon's weather is the length of the winters.

The coldness of the climate through June

Rain!

The warm, bright weather seems increasingly later every spring/summer. Climate change here is starting to look like wetter, darker, longer.

Lack of sun. Grey skies are oppressive (and hold down air pollution).

Not enough sun and light in winter. (Willamette Valley)

It rains too much and it is too gray for too many days.

a lot of rain, continuous. But hey God controls it, he knows what we need.

winter is too long, cold, wet and dreary

I don't like all the rain

Sick of rain and gray skies; sick of liberal loons that are in abundance in the I-5 corridor.

rain

I am a 64 year old Native Oregonian, born and bred of Pioneer Oregon Stock. Raised on the Southern Coast, third generation Commercial Fisherman, we would always comment on our two seasons; nine months of rain, and three months of bad weather! In actuality it was either warm weather with rain, and the wind from the South, or cold weather with Sun, and the wind from the North. Now I have lived in the Valley area for over twenty five years, and there are seasons. Sun, sometimes with warm, rain, warm in Fall and Spring, and wet Winters. Walt Witman's description of Portland pretty much fits every thing west of the Cascades, "Portland is a City with a great Grey Gloom Hanging over it." The only thing more irritable, and more depressing, and in all probability the main cause of divorce and alcoholism in Oregon than the weather is the Politics. I have our Family Histories to draw from. Did I mention that my wife is also from Pioneer stock, born and bred?
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Too cold for too long
We need more sun and global warming, too many dark cloudy days.
Cold in seasons outside of winter, lack of snow in winter, WIND!
Too cold and wet.
Long, dark, cold winters.
The cold would not be so bad if it weren't so windy here in Central Oregon. We love the sunshine, but not the wind.
What a stupid question. The weather is the weather.
When I moved here in 1995, the winters were reasonable. For the past few years they have lasted for nine months!
We are in June and it's still too cold and wet to enjoy a Little League game. Why has "global warming" brought us such ridiculously long winters? I do believe we are having climate change, but it has nothing to do with people. It has to do with the sun's activity, and I'm tired of politicians using Al Gore's idiot theory to punish people by taking more and more money out of our pockets for all this so-called "green" technology.
the rain, the gloomy grey skies, the fact that im vitamin D deficient due to lack of sunlight
It's not just the rain, it's the multiple consecutive days of overcast conditions. I'm very seriously considering moving simply because I want more sun in my life.
Grey, grey, grey. Lack of sun for too many days.
Too much cloudiness. Too much rain that comes is slow drizzles over an extended period of time.
I would rather prefer the warmth of sparkling sunshine to a perpetual drizzle, an overcast sky and cold and gloomy days.
n = 33

6 What climate changes have you noticed over the last 15 to 20 years?
I think we are seeing disruptions from the weather pattern I grew up with in the Portland area in the 1950's and 60's. There is less snow, more heavier rains, warmer temps during the summer months and actually throughout the year. Flowers are blooming earlier and birds seem to be arriving earlier. There are also animal species that I remember in the Columbia Gorge that no longer seem to be present.
Longer rainy season; shorter, cooler summers
Grew up in Central Oregon - seems like there used to be more snow, colder temps in the winter.
until the past couple of years, I was under the impression that the winters had been milder & drier, but it seems like we've reverted to longer wetter springs and shorter, hotter (?) summers.
Some years pineapple sage, a cold-sensitive plant, has made it through the winter, and some years not.
Rainier some parts of the year, less snow in the winter, generally more extreme.
Wetter winters, shorter summers.
I was surprised at the rain... it's gotten harder. And the summers have gotten hotter. 106?
Harder winters (more snow in Portland) Cooler summers
Changes in when seasons start, changes in severity of weather-related events.
Length of rainy season.
Warmer summer evenings
More rain Less snow in the valley More flooding
Cooler and wetter
I feel that our springs are colder and wetter in recent years. I seem to recall for sticking snow in the valley many years ago.
Weather cycles. You have colder and wetter years followed by warmer and dryer years,
Hotter summers for longer stretches of time, and colder winters into the teens and single digits.
The spring is longer and wetter. The summer is not as hot. We can expect to get snow and ice, whereas in the past it wasn't that way.
Longer, later, wetter springs. Fewer periods of snow & freezing rain in the winter.
I believe these past three years we are getting more rain. It feels like summer is getting shorter. It feels like there is less distinction between the four seasons. It feels like really hot summer and really cold overcast wet winters.
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More variability; more frequent extreme events, with a tendency towards a lower overall winter snowpack. The winter begins in October and continues through June. Constant rain and cold weather.

I think, in Pdx anyway, we have more very hot days in the summer than e used to - but maybe it is my imagination. Although not this year, but several times lately, the spring has been warmer than I remember. The weather seems less predictable. but, we do not have the extremes and the troublesome weather that many areas in the US is having of late.

Very late snowfall - hail in the summer, and more overcast days. Despite the rain, earlier bud break on firs there’s less snow in the mountains than there used to be. and many of the glaciers on the cascades are smaller. the last two years have had exceptionally cold wet springs. That's a simple question. Here's the simple answer. The weather is in a constant flux. Always has been, always will be.

Fewer winters with snow, longer rainy seasons. longer, wetter springs; hotter summers; more snowstorms appropriate crops moving north. greater storm variability. More super-hot (>90) days each summer. Wetter and more variable conditions (actually, often colder) year round.

Somewhat hotter hottest days in summer. Generally greater extremes, in precipitation Increasing wave heights More coastal flooding

It’s less predictable. I moved here in 1974, and until I moved to the coast in 1982, our winters were reliably snowy (20 feet of snow on Mt. Hood; I was an active cross-country skier and paid attention to that) and our summers were reliably sunnier. I lived at the coast from 1982-1989 and noticed changes (bigger storms, record rains, odd bird die-offs and mass bird migrations) that later were ascribed to El Nino and La Nina. I discussed my observations with many long-time residents and researchers at OSU and UO, and those involved with environmental organizations, and no one could explain them then. I moved back to Portland in 1989 and don’t know what “normal” weather and climate are anymore. I know many bird species are declining. I hear regularly about weather records being broken.

cooler wetter springs, less snow overall though
much wetter the past few springs

Milder summers, longer rainy season. Garden planning is 3 weeks behind this year, at least!

More Extreme temperatures and less sun in the spring and summer

More severe storm events and small increase in average temperatures. Less snow at low elevations. Cooler, more rain in the spring; rain patterns changing, eg larger amounts of rain per day/storm.

When I was in elementary school in the early 90s, it seemed we always got snow in the winter, and it seems less frequent now (though that could be my idealizing my childhood).

It seems like the extremes are more extreme--higher fluctuations from cold to hot and longer rainy seasons. Hotter spikes in the summer and gloomier springs.

Springs seem wetter and colder
Fewer snowy days in the Willamette Valley.

The weather seems increasingly confusing, seasons change with fits and starts - sudden warmth in February that used to arrive in March (at the end); rain continuing on into June that used in end in early May; less sunshine in the valley as well as Portland.

Some years it is warmer and some years it is collier. I think overall it is getting cooler in the summer.

Winters are not as extreme, less snow and ice storms summer starts a little later fewer dry, crisp windy fall days with clear skies

Less cold weather, less snow

Oregon has gotten warmer on average over the years, with fewer days of ice and snow, a smaller snow pack, and more drought in dry parts and more wet in wet parts of our state.

I seem to remember larger drifts of snow. Also, it seems to me we used to have longer periods of temperatures
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in the 70's when I was younger. Now, we seem to jump from the 50's to the 80's suddenly. Of course, I have seen photos of the early autos driving on the solid ice of the Willamette.

Thunderstorms seem odd for the NW
it's drier than in the past
More extreme weather,

Less snowpack, more rain on snow events, earlier run-off, greater discharge. Nothing drastic has occurred yet, but I detect subtle changes in natural patterns that may indicate that serious consequences are forthcoming. The pH of the Pacific Ocean off the Oregon Coast is becoming more acidic and as the ocean should provide a huge buffer, this is startling. It appears that there have been 6 years of recruitment failure of the Japanese oysters in some mariculture facilities, e.g. Hama Hama Oyster Farm on the Hood Canal. Dead zones are now appearing along coastal Oregon, climate change might play some role in that and southern species of birds extending their ranges northward (Audubon Christmas Bird Count).

warmer winters warmer springs much more severe "pine apple express" rain storms longer and hotter heat waves in mid-summer
The Willamette Valley seems to get a little less rainfall.
We seem to be getting our summers later.
In the past couple of years, the winter has been drier and the fall is colder
I think we are having slightly warmer summers and colder winters with more snow on the valley floor than we use to.
Winters come later, springs seem to linger longer. Even coastal Californians call it “June Gloom”, but it seems to last longer here each year. Here on the So. Oregon coast, it doesn’t seem to be as warm in the summer as when we first moved here in 1973.
It seems like we’re getting wetter and possibly hotter. We've been seeing a lot of flooding around the NW, and those hot days of summer seem hotter. I think maybe winters are getting colder too.
The raining season seems to be a bit more concentrated. The winter seems drier than normal. The weather seems to be not consistent, hot days followed by cold days, etc.

I would put the time period in last 3-4 years but it seems like winter and spring are wetter than usual, at least cloudier, and we have fewer brilliant sunny days in January/Feb and in April. Also summer seems to start later.
But I would say in last 3-4 years, not over past two decades.
later summers, more rain/cloudy days, shorter garden growing season
The winters seem to be wetter and colder.
More rain and a larger snow pack.

Weird swings of very dry when usually wet, and wet when usually dry. Longer to really feel like summer.
More humid. Because of La Nina, the last two summers were cloudy, humid, rotten.
Less snow and precipitation most years this year being an expection.
Less rainfall scattered during the summers-helps with gardening and keeping the dust down!
The seasons seem to be shifting months, things happening later. There seems to be more late freezing that kills newly growing fruits and vegetables than I remember

See my previous answer.

I've noticed that snow is less common in Portland, and that there are more "bad" ski years. However, I think this last point was most extreme in the late 1990s/early 2000s. The last 4-5 years have seen much better, with only one bad season (last year 09-10) which was an el nino year.

A trend to wetter spring weather.

It has gotten warmer earlier in the year. Notably warmer winters.

Heavier rain downpours in fall.
Summers have become MUCH hotter.
Milder and wetter winters and changes in the summer and fall.
Winters are milder and summers are hotter.
I have seen longer, wetter winters
More longer La Nina following more El Nino. avg rainfall lowered. areas of greater droughts. normal weather
patterns disturbed as in fewer days of rain when normally so. More fucking pollution. sorry.
Changing conditions with El Nino or La Nina. Cooler or hotter than normal. More or less rain.
Colder, wetter, cloudier
Less snow
Reduced glaciers and more variable snow pack. Changes to arrival dates of migratory birds, more invasive
species and beetle killed forests. Recent years have seemed to bring much more variable weather events.
As a skier I have witnessed highly variable snow pack. As a gardener I am seeing more extremes- some years I
can push the climate zone envelope, other years everything marginal for the Willamette valley dies. Dryer
summers have stressed even well established native plants. As a bird watcher I have noticed the expansion of
some specie's range, and some once common birds are now rare.
more and longer hot spells in summer
cooler and wetter springs
Wet season seems longer, summer seems shorter.
Warmer. I live in the Western Columbia River Gorge, where ice storms have gone from common to rare.
No Spring to speak of. Shorter summers. Heavier rains in the winter instead of the many drizzle days.
The extremes seem more reaching
Much less snow during the winter, and more droughts and water concerns due to less snowpack and less rainfall.
More fluctuation yet few more real day to day extremes Seems like lately there are more mild days yet more cool
days too across the calendar
The effects of global warming, more rain, warmer, extremes of temperature.
More thunderstorm type activity, with sudden heavy rain or hail, and less long gray light rain days. Aumsville
tornado!! More storms with high winds here in the W. valley. warmer nights less rain in the summers more ice
storms
Summers may be getting warmer? A/C was entirely optional years ago -- perhaps more necessary now.
Snow pack has decreased noticeably. Mt. Hood lost much of its snow pack years ago and it is obvious when you
visit Timberline. The hill is full of scree, left after the snow pack melted. Its not a snowy peak anymore in
summer and fall.
Have not had the two week dry period in February. Years back used to plant spring oats in February.
Later seasons, mostly.
More severe highs and lows
Summer is later; more flooding; more freak weather, like the tornado touching down in the Willamette Valley.
August is too hot
I know that weather and climate are too different things. But, I feel we have had less snow here in the valley in
the winters. I actually kept track of that as a teacher for 30 years, because I always noted 'snow days' in my
lesson plans. I began teaching in '73 and in those earlier years, we have more 'snow days.' Also, it seems to be
much rainier in the springs, but I have no empirical evidence on that one.
Hotter summers, less snow (some years), more variable flowering/blooming times for plants and trees.
i BELIEVE IT GETS A LITTLE HOTTER AND IT SEEMS LIKE IT HAS BEEN GETTING A LITTLE WETTER ALSO.
The weather is definitely more hot & humid during summer now then when I was growing up - I'm now 36 - and
the sunlight feels more intense for sure. June was always my favorite month because it was always beautiful &
sunny yet the temp was in the '70s - my definition of what used to be typical June weather. Now people are
starting to call it Juneuary, yikes! Daily weather seems to be more variable now & really only 2 seasons: rainy
season and 3-4 months of hot/humid. The winters have always been rainy yet the past 2 winters have been
super wet, even I have been a bit tired of the rain and I was born here!! Then the Arctic Blast of 2008 as the
News called it, very out of character for what Portland winter storms were between 1980 & 1990 (Born in 1975,
my family moved in 1985 to Kalama, WA on the Columbia River). Back then, we might get a couple inches of
snow here & there. When a winter storm hit, it was an ice storm & the whole city, sometimes the region, would
be covered in a layer of ice for 2-3 frigid days.
A slower spring and more abrupt weather changes
Glacier run-off in mountain areas has definitely increased.
I have noticed warming of overall temperatures, with hotter summers especially. I notice that the wet season is getting wetter and lasting longer. There is more flooding. Temperatures in summer are increasingly uncomfortably hot, which I hate -- I liked the more comfortable warm sunny summers we used to have. Weather overall is becoming more extreme -- sometimes it seems we go from winter directly to a late summer with no spring in between.

The Willamette Valley has less severe winter storms with an abundance of snow. We have had an unusually wet spring the last two years.

The area I live in used to get several feet of snow every winter, so the old timers tell me. Sometimes we get snow and other years almost none. This year it was wetter and we had snow, but it didn't get as cold since the weather was coming out of California. I live in the mountains' shadow and the weather goes around us most of the time. Our weather varies depending on the jet stream, whether it comes from the north or west or south. Many areas around us got 150% of their average snowfall.

rainier springs; hotter summers; longer "rainy seasons"

Well first we must that Oregon has extreme weather all the time and many books have been written on the subject. Some years it is hot and drier and like this year cold and wetter, but to me it seems that over all we have a mild climate compared to other states.

Cycles. They're normal.

annual late summer drought conditions late snows reduced snow pack early snow melt warmer wetter winter months wetter summer months

Warmer winters. Later summers... Or so it seems.

Snowpack decreasing. Very evident.

Less winter snow on the valley floor. More extremes.

Plants are adjusting to weather suited for California, snakes (harmless) not seen in Oregon are moving up. More wildfires, crazy weather (tornado in Oregon!)

less snow in the mountains most years - it's a problem for Klamath County ag people

Record breaking changes in the weather pattern such as the Columbia River being at an all-time high at present.

Cooler winters

Flower bulbs bloom several weeks earlier. I enjoy making May Day baskets and leaving them on friends' doorsteps. The arrangements of these baskets has changed since the early 1980's as, for example, daffodils are mostly all done blooming by 1 May. I was muttering about that this year. Rains are harder now. La Nina and El Nino are well defined and tracked. Each of these seems to establish itself very firmly, creating more impact.

First, 15 or 20 years is a drop in the bucket. The climate changes year to year, always has always will

The tilting of the earth has changed the seasons slightly. Just as they taught us in grade school , the earth is tilting on it's axis and this will make a gradual change in the climate. Nothing to do with so-called global warming or CO 2 or buzzwords like greenhouse gas.

This past spring on the east side: much, much more wind and moisture, both.

less snow accumulation at higher elevation. 2010-11 season the ever present exception. seasons of the year seem to have moved backward a month or so.

I go back to the late 40's and early 50's, when we had some very cold weather. There has always been a fluctuation in both hot and cold, and wet and dry weather, influenced by the sun, and sun spots, and the ocean currents. Many would like to attribute this to human beings, but I don't believe any of this. Just follow the money and who will see who stands to gain.

every year is different

Weather changes all the time. Our "climate" is essentially the same as it's always been over the past twenty years and longer. Some summers are hotter than others, some are quite mild and pleasant. Same goes for Winter, some are colder than others and some are quite mild and pleasant. Sometimes we get more rain in the spring sometimes less. When I was a child it was common to hear people say, "you can't predict the weather." It's still true. Technology has given us the ability to make better guesses but forecasting the weather is still not 100% and never will be. Take today for example 6/3/2011 the forecast was rain, however it was a beautiful day with no rain. That's not climate change and the weather forecast was wrong!

Seems that we have more extremes than before, either more hot weather or more cold weather. It also seems to rain more.
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Over the past 15 to 20 years, there has been less frost in the summers which is good for the crops, but I also remember the cooling trends of the 60's and 70's and the cry that we were entering an ice age. The data that I've seen going back more than 100 years shows warming and cooling cycles and I don't believe the current cycle is out of the ordinary. The warm cycle of the 1930s was warmer than the current one.

It is cyclic. There was Global Cooling in the 70's.

Here in Bend we get less snow. Same in Portland (where I moved from).

Patterns of early and late springs, warmer and cooler spring/summers, harsher and milder winters. It's not a trend on any of it, but rather some differences back and forth over the last 20+ years

It changes every year.

It changes throughout the year as the earth axis tips toward the sun and away from the sun.

Lived here for 65 years and nothing out of the normal

LONGER, COLDER, WETTER SEASONS. NOT SO MUCH SUMMER. COOLER TEMPS IN THE SUMMER

I have only been here for 10.5 years but it seems like we get less snow than before. El Nina made this year an exception but overall, the snow season seems shorter and more unpredictable.

It seems that we have more "La Nina" years. We have more wet months per year on the west side.

Wetter, more cloudy

Wetter winters, drier summers. Occasional very mild winters and fewer truly cold ones.

Less snow but colder weather

It has been wetter

central oregon is cloudier

It's become COLDER! I remember the 90's and early 2000's being warmer than the last few years.

Winter seems longer, spring is pouring over into summer, fall seems to start on time, but summer seems short. some years are dry, some years are wet, some years are hot, some years are cool. It seems to me that the weather goes thru cycles. My great grandfather who came to the Prineville area in the 1890s always said as he saw it the weather changed in 50 year cycles. In the 60s I saw lots of snow. and then there were years when we didn't have much snow. Now 50 years later the snow pack is approaching the levels of the 60s. Just looking at the last 15 to 20 years seems like a small sample.

Getting cooler overall

More volatile changes to wet/dry and warm/cool cycles. Still less than other places -- but more and more over time. I work in the ski industry so I pay closer attention to seasonal norms than the average person. We are clearly getting more variability than 15-20 years ago. The strength of this year's La Nina is just one example.

Shifting of "expected" seasonal weather conditions. Some seasons seem longer/shorter from year to year...

I have only been here since 2001, but I've noticed the winters in Central Oregon have become more overcast, threatening rain more often than the bright sunny snow days that we experienced when we first moved here.

longer to thaw out in the spring

Central Oregon seems wetter

loss of snow pack at varying elevations in some years and subsequent loss of stream flow in summer

It is more windy.

I have noticed several changes from cooler springs to warmer springs with the same type of changes for all the seasons. These changes have appeared to be between 3 to 5 year cycles.

Weather events seem to be less frequent, but more severe than I remember them in past years. I also seem to remember that weather cycles and seasons seemed to be more consistent over time than they are now.

Colder and shorter summer season.

More cloudy skies.

usually less winter precip and warmer temps, except for this past winter 2010/2011. Shorter summers of late, will cooler and sometimes wet weather arriving in early to mid-August. Reduction in thunderstorm activity towards end of summer in last 2-3 years

As previously stated, sixteen years ago, we had an actual summer. We could plan on part of June, July and August, and sometimes even September to be sunny and warm, to be able to go to the lakes for kayaking and not freeze to death. I can remember going to Munch and Music and actually feeling too hot. This hasn't happened
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in the last few years.
We seem to be having wetter spring seasons and less incidents of snow in the winter seasons. The snowpack may remain near normal, but glaciers on Mt. Hood have retreated significantly.
wetter cooler springs, hotter dryer summers
I have observed that the weather has been trending towards cooler, wetter, summer and colder, longer winters. Man is not a factor in the weather. The notion that mankind effects the weather presumptuous and silly.
The change occurs in 'cycles'. Some years are cold & wet, others are dry. I've observed cycles for 75 years.
less snow in Bend.
Less snow amounts in Central Oregon
A bit harsher winters (coldest cold seems to be 2-3 degrees colder). Longer, cooler, wetter springs. Some plants that couldn't grow here before now do okay.
more precipitation
Longer wet cool season on the east side of the Cascades.
Warmer and less rain in spring (this spring an exception). Less snow, 25 yrs ago kids made snowmen all the time, now no snow. Used to have to break ice on animal waters all the time in winter, never now.
More dramatic shifts of very different weather in a 24 hr time period.
Less snow below 6000 ft.
a variety, but they seem to have so much to do with el nino & la nina weather patterns that I don't know how to recognize climate change related changes.
Before 20 years ago we were cooler in fact in the 50's we were alot cooler and wetter, starting the by the late 70's we were slowly changing into warmer weather. Now it appears we maybe headed back to the weather of the 50's.
shorter, milder winters
flooding worse. More snow in winter.
less snow in winter cooler, wetter and longer springs
more rain, less sunlight, colder
Winter is a little longer and wetter than when we first moved here 20 years ago. The summer hot spells of a few days have become several days with not as many evenings requiring a sweater.
Shifting in when the winter actually begins and ends, amount of persipitation during certain periods of the year, and number of days with significant sunlight.
more sever weather patterns. It seems that everything in Oregon used to be more mellow 15 years ago.
It seems like we have had more storms, wind gusts, and general extremes. Less predictable. Windier conditions are what I have noticed the most.
Hotter summers. Rain lasting longer into the Spring.
It seems as if the there has been a shift of a month or more on the seasons and general weather patterns. Winter is later as is spring, plus there is more rain later in the year. It is slightly warmer when we finally get to summer which is now shorter. The water well levels continue to drop as we grow, and there is basically no surface water rights available in the state anymore except for the seasonal high winter flows. So growing communities must look elsewhere for water - hopefully using more Aquifer Storage and Recovery technolgy.
Some of the summer temperatures seems to be a bit higher. Also teher do seem to be more occasionally sun breaks in teh fall & winter.
My 40-acre woodland, mixed conifers with both black and white oak, shows some stand mortality due to overstocking, a shortage of soil moisture which limits 'pitching out' mountain pine bettle and Douglas fir engraver a problem. My thinning from below has slowed the conifer loss but the weak timber market would not cover logging and hauling cost; I'm reluctant to spend my money to subsidize the harvest. Maybe this wet winter will give me another year or two of healthy growth. My 45-acres of pasture are irrigated from a stored water right but sustained global warming likely would seriously limit both down-slope water movement and refill of water stored in lake,
Seems to be wetter (rainy) longer, and hotter longer in the summer. The winters also seem to be getting colder.
First, the summers were hotter. Now, the last couple years, the springs have been longer and wetter.
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More rain in the spring with earlier rain in the fall. Larger waves in the ocean. The rain patterns seem to be different than when I first moved here in 1996. Also seeing more snow and snow later into the spring than in previous years. wetter
The winters seem less severe and the summers hotter except for last year. less snow in jan-feb, more rain in spring and longer cool weather
More extremes in every way.
It seems to stay cooler in the Spring.
Slightly more extremes, including a longer rainy season, and shorter summer.
Seems like we have more cloudy days than we used to.
hotter, longer stretches of remarkable weather
seemed to snow more 10 or 15 years ago.
While I was living in Central Oregon, I noticed that there were more and more air planes flying over the area and that cloud cover up above seemed to develop more because of so many con trails. I have noticed that birds that are not noted for being in our area have seemingly arrived. I have noticed that there are different "bugs" in the area - killing pine trees, and lady bugs swarming homes, and West Nile Virus. OK, Maybe these are just the effects of the changes...
Perhaps more rain and odd extremes
Cold then hotter and now cooler
weather seems more dramatic
When a forecast was for rain it usually was a gentle drizzle - now we get hard and fast rain. And the forecasters are telling us rain somedays and showers other times. We, to my knowledge, never had a differential.
It seems, especially in the mid '90's and again these past two years, that it has been wetter. The past two years, it also seems that the rain lasts longer into the spring, and then we've had a short, really hot summer - no fun either way. But in the mid 2000's, it seemed we had a string of really cold winters for a week or two.
25 yrs -- winter storms less violent -- rainfall less predictable.
When I was little we had more snow and I remember severe ice storms. Seem like winter is more just plain old rain now in the metro area. Which is fine with me as I adore rain. But snow is fun for kiddos. and good for the mountain snow melt....Also, recently, summers have seemed a good deal cooler and last summer was pretty wet in my memory, not sure about the actual historical stats though.
The seasons have seemed to shift. We seem to be having wetter and cooler springs. The summery weather continues, as least temperature-wise during the day until Halloween.
Wild fluctuations in weather
Nile fever and other tropical maladies.
Earlier onset of budding dates in many plant species. This is indisputable.
rainy season is longer and the summers are shorter
average temperatures do seem to be increasing. California weather patterns are creeping northward.
hotter summer

What do you attribute this change in climate to?
Climate change is real, but there are other factors that add up to variability in climate, obviously.
Climate change is likely due to a variety of factors, including natural patterns which scientists don't even fully understand yet, and human activity. It is irresponsible to label climate change as solely due to human activity.
How can we really know what it is? We can have theories they may be right they may be wrong
All of the above are interacting
Both human and natural
I SUSPECT climate change but do not know.
partly carbon and partly natural (decadal oscillation, low sunspot activity, randomness, etc but how am I
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really supposed to know?
planes, trucks and car emissions
All of the above, we cannot deny that Earth operates under some much larger cycles yet I also definitely believe carbon & human activity are a huge catalyst to speeding up climate change
changes may be natural but have been greatly accelerated by human activity
Truefully I don't think we really know, and are trying to give our best educated guess, there is to much missing information
Ocean temps
all of the above, but to thge largest extent, atmospheric pollution caused by human err.
It is presumptuous to assume humans really effect much and arrogant to think we have no effect. I know it's changing; not "why".
Human activity + ocean cycles
There is none.
Solar Activity
Normal changes - No actual change in climate
both human and natural
natural cycles such as el nino and la nina
not one thing, but a combination
the sun, earth orbit
I've read many reports which blame the sun's activities for our climate changes, which is the only thing that makes any sense,,
a combination of human activity and natural causes. More carbon in the atmosphere definitely plays a role
all of the above
I beleive climate change is occurring.
Some of these effects could be "naturally occurring" weather patterns, more carbon looks to have a real impact also; but most if it I'm not really sure...
climate change is underway
combination of human activity and cycles of nature, such as La Niña.

9 What indoor activities do you do regularly?
Movies, studying
playing w/ child
Sports
Movies and board games
take up space
Photography
computer gaming
Activist meetings
Movies, cooking, mothering an infant
work, mainly on phone & computer

10 What outdoor activities do you do regularly?

street hockey
work outdoor
swimming
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skateboarding
Disc golf, just being out and about
Farming
Work. Forestry.
winsurfing
Basketball
Rock climbing, mountain biking
BBQing
backpacking
Dog related activities
I teach outdoor fitness classes year round
Horseback Riding
Surfing
walking
weeding as needed and it is dry
climbing
horse back riding
reading in the sun, watching grandchildren play in a park
Running
baseball/softball, kickball
alpine and rock climbing
tennis
windsurfing, surfing, outdoor photography
farming
Horseback riding
Climbing
work outdoors
gardening
horse riding
Birding
horse activities
Jogging is not walking, x-country skiing is not downhill skiing
walking; birding; enjoy our myriad parks
archery, thrown weapons Ie knives, axes, medieval re enactment
horses
camping
Mushroom picking Member of OMS
foraging - mushrooms, huckleberries and more
if our air was no so deadly toxic, I would return to more outdoor activities that I
enjoyed before moving to Portland.
work
horse activities
softball/baseball
white water rafting
Favorite: ATVing
Skiing
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Motorcycle riding and driving
Working on my forest land
Shooting Sports
Liberal tipping
yard work
farming
horses atv
motorcycling
riding quads
forest restoration
OHV use
just sit outside and enjoy
motorcycling
Parks, play with kids
hang gliding
Bird watching
preparing fire wood
swimming, jet ski, four wheeling
Bird Watching
motorcycling
Skiiing
I sail and farm. Your questions reflect an urban sensibility
Geocaching
work to pay OR state Taxes!
Work, farming. Some has to feed Americans.
Motorcycling
Riparian restoration in the Coast Range.
Disc Golf
Surfing
Dog parks
nature photography
Cattle ranching
outdoor dining
Mountain Biking
I use a lot of public transportation when the weather is poor but walk most of my erronds otherwise. I a walker mostly.
walking
geocaching

Check any of the following that have affected your outdoor activities:

11
(Other responses filled in)

Very hard rain
cooler, longer, wet springtimes
Rain in the spring delaying camping
rain
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More rain
More rain and Cold shortens growing season
Climate varies day to day, year to year.
More snow in the mountains, which delays high-country hiking in the summer
rain
weekend commuting
ice or poor air quality days
drought cycles seem longer, increases in water withdrawal make groundwater less available and some streams have been drained dry.
more rain it seems so fewer outings
more rain, more cold
wetter winters
rain
less snow some years, but lots of snow other years, so depends on the year
Late snowpack in more than one year
More snow on the mountains
too much snow
more snow in the mountains. btw, your answers are leading.
fires are caused by lack of forest management. Lumberjacks did a better job than government.
road being closed on public lands
growing season impacts
cold temperatures lasting longer
non-existent spring
Rain and cooler weather this last year
more snow
rain and more rain
colder weather
Costs of gasoline. More government restrictions on use of rivers, lakes and land. More costs to fish and hunt, and more limitations. Making a living Commercial Fishing was taken away from my family through Government mismanagement, foolish fuel additives, smog control devices, restrictive use of "Public Lands." The taking away of the Oregon Citizens Highway, through legislation, thus barring open use of beaches. Allowing Sea Lions to become vermin and to totally remove any enjoyment of sport crabbing or fishing. Placing a license of clamming. Anything the Governments do effects my enjoyment of freedom of outdoor activities.
This question assumes the statements are true, which I don't agree with.
Idiots
I ski when there's enough snow in my yard, and some winters there is none.
WETTER COLDER SEASONS
Rain and clouds
Wind and precip
poor forest managment
Global Warming is a hoax
rainy springs
personal health changes
the wind makes it colder in most months
All of those answers are BIASED
less snow on some years, not this past one
extremely wet
cold weather 6 months a year requires us to own all 4X4 cars
The too-long winters!
One again your questions are skewed to elicit a set of responses with suggests a belief in mankind effecting weather patterns
Drier fall
work constantly to pay OR taxes!
Rain and cold
sometimes less snow (like last year) or too much wind (like this year)
Rain or overcast conditions
fewer dry days
Long wet springs!

13 What do you think about the "climate change" issue?
It’s an attempt to extort taxpayers into funding nonsensical schemes that purport to affect climate.
That it is a normal cycle
The idea that the state of the science of climatology is so precise that we can say with great accuracy what’s happening to our climate is a joke. HUGE amounts of carbon have been pumped into the Earth’s atmosphere since the start of the Industrial Revolution, but where it has all gone since then is still really unknown.
It’s baloney. There has ALWAYS been cycles of climate change. Man should be good stewards of the planet, but I’m totally against government taking away our freedoms with more rules, regulations, land grabs from private citizens, more taxes, etc all imposed to give government and special interests more power over our lives, all in the name of mostly phoney science.
Anthropogenic sources are not responsible for climate change, and a much more serious matter is the cooling of the climate as opposed to the warming of the climate, both of which are affected by the output of the sun and not mans output of CO2, or any other so called "GHG". There are many other areas that are in need of public funds. Spending them on this subject is irresponsible and reckless.
A BUNCH of HORSE MANURE being forced down our throats, just like OBUMMERCARE. What a crock of bull manure this major lie is! Environmentalists are nothing more than scared chicken littles trying to kill jobs, farm production, or whatever “they” deem to their “cause” like protecting some insignificant fish.
It is not human related
Its all bullshit designed to raise taxes and impose more regulations
I think it is a bullshit way of taking more of our money and freedoms. I believe that it is a giant ponzy scheme and the should be ashamed to try to pull that kind of shit.
I believe it is all a scam. The earth is actually getting cooler. More wildfires are due to a buildup in fuels, not weather. The earth is not getting warmer.
I think it is hyped up in order to reduce economic acitvity and to draw money into and line the pockets the non-profit environmentalists' community.

11 What is it about "climate change" that makes you skeptical?
climate is not constant it goes in cycles
I think pollution is a far more important reason to make lifestyle change, and I feel frustrated that the carbon discussion eclipses this.
It still hasn't been proven. The weather all around the world changes all of the time from a long cold streak to a hot streak. I feel that the climate change folks are pushing an agenda that most folks do not want to take part in. If there was truly proof that this exists then I would be more likely to go along. At this time, I feel that the whole "Green agenda" is being pushed by both communists (Van Jones) and Socialists (Cas Sunstein) who would like to use climate change as a cover for social reform. No thanks!
I think there are people using this term to push their adjendas in other areas. It is called "politics".
The fact that it's too convenient for certain special interest groups to believe. The fact that it is most often presented in a "belief" format, instead of a scientific analysis. The fact that skeptical points of view are opposed with belligerence and mockery, instead of science-based rebuttal. The believable scientific analysis I've seen does not point to the doomsday scenarios that have been popularized, but instead suggest a small human effect on the climate that is well within natural tolerances for compensation. The doomsday scenarios rest upon far too many unproven "keystone" arguments, while constantly referring back to proven, but unalarming portions of their model as "proof".

Everyone is always looking for a "cause". This just feels like the one people pretend to care about now. I believe the issue is more agenda driven than science driven. It has the potential to create a major financial impact. For most it will become a burden, for some is will create great wealth. It appears that the most "definitive" proof available has been tampered with and skewed toward an unavoidable "worst case" outcome when in fact the potential may be there but it is highly unlikely.

This winter/spring is an example. I've covered the pepper plants three nights, due to frost and it's the middle of June. Where is all this global warming?

We have been informed by "experts" that we are facing a new ice age, and then a few years later we are facing global warming. I have concluded the "experts" don't know any more about the weather than I do. The non-science facts being spouted from non-scientist over human impact as the cause! And who have a private Agenda derived from the UN Agenda 21. Past geological, astronomical events that prove, under science, that our earth constantly changes. Weather patterns change, ocean currents change, geological events happen which cause atmospheric changes...etc. The list goes on.

It is a scheme to take money and re-distribute. Cap and Trade in Europe is a scam and hasn't resulted in any decrease in GHG!

I'm skeptical about the CAUSE not the fact that it's 'changing'!

It's the proposition that people are causing it. Climate change occurs natually.

It is cyclical.....end of story

Everything. It is flat out narcissistic arrogance to believe that the earth has been here BILLIONS of years and that we have ANY control over what's happening. Belief in God and His Word help me to know that this is expected, has been prophesied, and that we are all in His hands. Nothing is going to happen to this planet until He deems it time.

The facts. Human influence on planetary climate is negligible and is far overshadowed by natural phenomena. The "Man-made global warming" hoopla is attributable to two things: the insatiable desire for continued governmental growth and control, and money. Let's be honest, here: you and Angus and a host of others depend upon "agw" for your livelihoods; absent that, or something like it, you would be obliged to seek gainful, productive employment. Where's the fun in that?

The science used to define this "global warming" has been proven falsified. All data is interpreted by the subjective human brain. Many factors contribute to changes. All people, including naturists and naturalists, stand to gain economically by political policy changes.

The idea that "everyone knows man made global warming is real". This statement is not accurate, there is sound evidence that mankind has nothing to do with it. (other warming periods thousands of years ago are so obvious as to make the first statement above ludicrous.) The use of climate change (formerly known as global warming) as a way to punish people for producing and contributing to our economy is nearly criminal.

The data used to show CO2's impact on average temperature, which is what the climate change topic is based on, clearly shows CO2 does not drive temperature, in college chemistry I have closely examined the data used to generate the now infamous graph along with solar activity data for the same time period, and the data clearly shows the sun is causing climate change.

I am unconvinced that whatever changes as might be occurring are not simply part of a natural cycle.

It's not man caused but natural cycle. It's just another spotted owl scape goat created by environmental radicals.

I really don't believe it is really occurring outside of the natural environment. I think the scoul of thought that man's activities are causing global warming/climate change is a bunch of hype! One active volcano can spuew as much greenhouse gases and particulate matter into the atmosphere in one eruption as man has contributed since the beginning of time! Man's activities are so insignificant in this arena that they essentially play little or no role at all! Al Gore and his ilk are full of B.S.
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We are really getting big headed if we think that we can control the climate. Take a look at an Earth shot from space. Do some rough calcs....you get the idea.

There is no scientific evidence that it is real. The weather has had cycles always. We have had weather in the past just like we are having today and back when people were crying global warming it was simmilar to times like during the depression/dust bowl. The real culprit is the sun it warms the earth, we have no control over it. Climate change has nothing to do about what people do or don't do or what has been done. All weather events are in God’s control - he gives us what we need and what we deserve.

gore is an idiot. whatever happened to the ozone layer? i thought we would be dead by now. when i was a kid, it was all about a ice age coming back. need i mention more?

As I said before I prefer the heat to a glacier a mile thick over my head, and that's what was here a few thousand years ago. We’ve been warming up ever since. We just happen to live at a time when this is a temperate zone; it hasn't always been so nice.

The waste I see. When timber was allowed to be harvested, there was a plan for reforesting and underbrush and other combustible growth was managed more sensibly. Oregon’s forests were beautiful and Oregonians prospered and enjoyed recreation, camping and fishing. We took pride in our beautiful state. Now that the environmentalist have gained control, fires grow out of control, people are kept out of the forest because "they might damage" it. Mother Nature and God did the job before and they did it so much better. There are so many rules and regulations one needs to be a lawyer to understand them. You can no longer enjoy pulling a fish out of the stream for fear it is the wrong kind or size. Licenses are prohibitively high, like everything else. Oregon is not Oregon anymore. I grew up here and I have always loved this state. I hate to see the spirit of the outdoors so restrictive.

Again we just currently don't have enough information to make a good informed decision, how much is normal, how much is the human race is truly causing. And how much is normal for the end of this planet and solar system? This is not meant to last forever.

Why it matters and what causes it.

The "Science" behind it....we have gone through different climate changes through out history we don't stop mother nature

The science has been manipulated. There is no such thing as man-caused global warming or climate change. This is a political agenda directed against a free market economic system, the end result of which will be lowering of our standard of living. This bogus science must continue to get exposed for what it is!

i feel it is made up and is some political agenda that it is man caused

Political rather than science based

The lack of credible science. The science growing up was a new ice age, now its global warming.

There is no climate change caused by mankind. Any changes are normal cycles and have always happened.

Take a look at the growth rings of any large tree and you will see many climate cycles.

The hype that it must be "believed", supported with erroneous data. Many avid proponents have an economic reason to sell it. The unbelievable arrogance that there is anything that humans can do anything substantive about it.

I am not skeptical about climate change. The climate has changed as has land mass for thousands of years. I am skeptical about the science behind man-made impacts. I do not believe that the pollution from everyday human activity has any meaningful effect on the climate. I’m for reasonable solutions to pollution that does affect life, and not just human life. However the planet will warm and cool as it see fit regardless of what humans do. Now, if the government purposefully blasts holes in the atmosphere or dumps enough aluminum particles in the air there will be affects but what those are is unknown at this time, except for the negative affects excess aluminum will have on animal and plant life over time.

Half of what we hear and read has been proven false, yet the politicians are laughing all the way to the bank.

It is bad science. The basis of it is fraud and meant to establish commerce controls on the populace via a carbon based economy that will evolve from debt bubble global economics. Controlling the clean versus dirty energy dialectic and the medium of commerce exchange [carbon units] will allow the resurgence of the technocracy efforts of early last century. People need be responsible. Care for the planet with wisdom. Pollute less. And grow technologies that are good for the environment. They best get educated as to the powers behind various global schemes. The Green movement was started by former Soviet President Gorbachev. Gore has also clearly
scammed many people to the extent that England will not allow him public address on the topic of Global Warming due to “anti-racketeering” gag orders on him. So keep a clean planet but don’t be stupid when it comes to Governmental scammers and bad science.

The goofballs supporting it, and the green [ aka communism ] movement destroying jobs in the northwest and around the country in the name of eco-freindly. We are ment to Use the earth and have a healthy balance with industry and nature. Not locking up the land as Wild and scenic.

There was a time that tropical ferns grew in Canada. Fossil finds in Canada prove it. Do you really think that humans caused it to be that warm up North?

earth’s climate is constantly changing. i don’t think man has much to do with the change

Man’s effect or influence, AGW (anthropogenic Global Warming) is a hoax. The effects of man’s activity on Earth are miniscule at best- climate has changed on Earth for eons- with or without man influencing climate. Historically peoples have moved due to droughts, floods, ice etc. We (the current inhabitants) may someday be forced to move as well. I could go on & on....

Most of the world’s leading scientists have proven that the whole issue of global warming (or the current popular term climate change now that global warming has been debunked) is a sham - created in good part to make a small group of people a lot of money. Gore promoted the whole scam, talked about the rising level of oceans from glacier melt - then went and bought a multi-million dollar mansion ON THE OCEAN~! This whole thing is absurd. Moreover, even if America were forced to do all the ‘green’ things being promoted, it would make not a bit of difference when compared to other countries who do nothing. I am all in favor of DRILL BABY DRILL - and stop relying on foreign energy sources.

The science is fuzzy. The ebbs and flows in the climate seems more like a natural flux than that of human interference. The government should stay out of this. Education is fine, but regulations and laws on buildings, transportation, etc. are over-reaching and have no place in America.

Too many times its been shown to be Fraudulent! Besides all we have done is send our ‘Dirty’ industry to China where they do less to curtail the Pollution!

The hype about it, most of you are not old enough to have been through many climate weather cycles.

Weather change is very complex and has been occurring since the earth was formed so how much humans have affected these changes is very questionable

Climate change is a naturally occurring matter, and continuing to talk about man made global warming when average temperatures are no longer going up is ludicrous.

I studied Meteorology in college in the 60’s and almost became a Meteorologist. I think Global Warming is an agenda by our governments, that employ these government scientists, to advocate and endorse this B.S. theory, all for the justification to raise taxes on the people for carbon and to control people and industry and give governments more power. I remember back in 1950, when I was 10yrs. old, Popular Mechanics and other magazines said we were going to run out of oil by 1994 and the oceans were going to rise and flood all the coast lines because of the melting Glaciers because of warming-Al Bullshit. I guess that was when all the propaganda and conditioning of all the people began after WWII. I guess they never heard of Archimedes Principal. Put ice and water in a glass and after the ice melts the water level is the same. The same as the icebergs and glaciers melting. This Environmental movement is all junk science and not the "Scientific Method" that I learned in school of running experiments over and over again to arrive at a scientific conclusion. Most independent scientists disagree with global warming because they don't get their salaries from government. Our sun and its radiation and sunspots control our weather here on earth along with earth's orbit around the sun. Why do you think we had ice ages on earth before?

To say that anthropogenic global warming occurs is absurd. The climate will do what it does in spite of our ego inspired arrogance.

Yhe manipulation of the "scientific " proof. The fact that it is getting colder. The use of AGW to increase the power of government to control my life.

Like evolution there is science that can support either side but the argument that man has caused climate change seems to be revenue driven by those who stand to gain from new laws and the hysteria of it all.

1) CO2 has a much higher impact in models than actual temperature measurements show. 2) The warm phase of the PDO from the late 1970s to mid 2000s had more of an impact than "consensus" scientists thought. 3) Water vapor (a greenhouse gas) and clouds (albedo increasing objects) are very poorly modeled, yet too much faith is put in model output. Garbage in, gospel out.

People like Al Gore and his mantra, and the ilk that supports his point of view. Much of the so called "climate
change intellectuals" have been debunked. Also these crazy carbon tax proponents only want to put their hands in someone else's pocket to enrich themselves, and others at the expense of average hard working people. One major earthquake, or volcano will change the climate faster than 6 billion people. Just wait and see...

Over long periods of time, nature shifts its cycles resulting in noticeably different weather patterns. Remember back in the 70s when everyone "in the know" was worried about global cooling?

The knowledge about existing climate is minuscule relative to the big picture of the world in it's entirety. Computer models have no value in determining the weather patterns. The notion that there is weather change is correct because there is always change in weather from the beginning of time. Weather men will always have job security. The misrepresentation of NASA and their weather predictions is just more evidence of Gore and the extortion machine at work.


Based on false science.

It is a lie, falsehood, falacy, fable, myth, misconception, distortion, deception, prevarication, fiction, untruth, fabrication, and one hell of a fish story! It rates right up there with Fossil Fuel, Chicken Little.

Weather is cyclical, it's always changing. Global Warming/climate change is manufactured, non-existent crisis. Just like acid rain and sunspots. Our universe was created to do exactly what it's doing. There has always been sunspots and solar flares, whether we could see them or not. The polar ice caps have been waxing and waning since the beginning of time only we haven't been watching them that long. The last 150 is nothing in the whole scheme of things.

While I agree that "climate changes" I don't agree that it is anything that we can cause or control. There are too many people getting rich and gaining power while preaching the religion of "global warming" now known as "climate change". There is no concrete proof that can be presented to justify the power play being forced upon the tax payers of the United States and the population of this planet.

I agree about the warming--it is obvious but I do not agree that it is largely human caused, after all it has occured several times before when humans did not have the capacity to change it like you think we do now.

The long term weather data doesn't support the "Global Warming" scare. The earth has been gradually warming since the last ice age. Over the past 1,000 years, warming cycles have marked advances in world civilization and prosperity. Cooling cycles have seen famine, disease, and world suffering. The earth has not responded as the computer models predicted and has not seen the jump in temperatures that were expected, hence the change in terminology from "global warming" to "climate change". It is the biggest hoax and fraud in World History. The so called experts will say just about anything to get more grant money. Take away the economic gain and the experts will go away. I am 60 years old and I remember back in the early 1970'a the warning about the coming Ice Age. The Sun is the primary determining factor for our climate. It is pure arrogance to think that the mankind could change the Climate or stop what Nature is doing. Also, there are volcanoes all over the planet which are belching out millions of tons of the so called Greenhouse gases. What are we going to do? Put giant corks in them.

I think it is part of a political agenda and has nothing to do with "climate change". The measurable impact that humans have. Water vapor is natural and the biggest greenhouse gas there is, it is natural.

It has no relation to science, religion yes, but not science.

The fact it has always occurred.

The climate is always changing. In the 1970's it was the coming ice age. Then you pushed global warming. When the hockey stick graph was proven a fraud now you're on to climate change. Gotta keep people scared so they send in there money.

The so called experts have only evaluated the climate for the past 45 years on a spectrum. if you look at the history of the planet climate change has occurred throughout our existence. to extrapolate it to a human cause or a human effect it is impossible to link. I would rather them take a stance on environmental health than climate change or global warming or what ever they will change it to in 2 years

The climate is constantly changing by definition and its change is to be expected and not likely to be predicted with any level of accuracy or certainty. There has been no statistical increase in global temperatures over the last 10 years so now the term has changed from "global warming" to climate change". The changes the earth's
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Climate undergoes over periods of time has very little, if anything, to do with human activities and a lot to due with solar patterns and orbital patterns. However a large portion of the scientific community, those intending to profit from "climate change", tend to ignore the science and focus on theories that are not accurate or provable. We are in the middle of an 80 year cycle which some people are trying to blame on humans. There is more CO2 put out by the volcano in Greenland than by man in the last 5 years. I believe the ethanol disaster that Oregon got us into is a typical of the "climate change joke".

See no climate change other than normal climate change. The climate change people called it global warming then changed it to climate change (cop out) and climate change is normal. Just look out the window and think back - nothing different.

I am an engineer. When I see the advocates of man made global warming trying to shut up skeptics, I get very suspicious. That is not how science is done.

I believe this was a hoxes. I think this is all driven with money and a way to create jobs for people that can't get a job somewhere else. I don't believe science supports this.

Recent studies from prominent climatologists show that climate change isn't caused by humans. Additionally, studies show that water vapor has much more of an effect on global temperatures than CO2 or other "greenhouse gasses"

Climate always cycles naturally. I don't see any huge trend toward global warming. I think the "danger" is overblown.

The climate has experienced extreme swings for thousands of years and there were either no or few humans and no SUV's that caused it. I think global warming is a scam to make some rich people richer at the expense of the gullible.

I think the current climate change is more an "earth cycle"

The climate is always changing regardless if we were on this big rock or not. I remember a time when it would snow at the beginning of winter and stay all season. But people forget those days. I've even seen it snow on July 4th many years ago. So I debunk the therapy of global warming.

Only in the last 20 years or so have we had the computer models necessary to start to understanding the highly complex issue of the Earth's ever changing climate. While humans may be affecting climate, more study needs to be done to accurately predict the outcome. Also, if we are affecting climate it may be less costly to deal with results of changing weather rather than try to reverse climate change.

We have a bunch of so call scientists who get paid for publishing global warming dysentery and attending gala conferences at the best and most costly resorts. The more radical views they have the more they get paid in their attempt to roll back the industrial age. They have gone into a panic mode over a globally averaged temperature change of a few tenths of a degree. I can remember some of the whackos predicting that the earth would be a dust bowl 20 years ago. They are tenured at our major Universities and still on the dole for their crack pot ideas. They have altered statistics and even changed the BS name from global warming to climate change. Just a bunch of dysentery, quit wasting my tax dollars on your anti business campaign.

Man's impact is minuscule as compared to the long term effect of solar flares, forest fires, volcanoes etc.

I believe it's nature not man

"science" driven to fit social engineering, an agenda and towards consensus is not real science

I don't think the science can predict global weather when the base of such studies is only a hundred to perhaps a few thousand years, this planet has been here over 4 billion years and we have no proof of what happened over such a long time.

I believe that our planet goes through climate cycles. They happen over a long period of time. Sure, carbon emissions have an effect on climate but, it's not the root cause.

Don't see it happening

I believe that change occurs naturally. Nothing ever stays the same and usually within a century repeats itself. Even weather. Yes people and all their buildings and gas guzzling vehicles make a difference but I do not believe that this is the sole problem.

I'm skeptical about man made climate change. The climate is always changing.

Need to look at the history, you see how it follows history. Look at your weather stations - if located in city how are they affected with the environment around. Asphalt, bulds, etc. that would skew the data.
There is too much "give us money and that will fix it". Yah we should clean up our mess but this is obviously
about profit. Also the earth's climate has been changing for billions of years and we think we can now decide
what it's going to do with a "spec in time" worth of data. How much carbon does a volcano put out?
it is false science
Every thing. There is a hidden agenda. Our tax dollars are wasted with this survey.
The hysterical position of MMGW advocates, their business restricting focus on perceived "solutions", and
incredible arrogance in believing that the earth's climate is being impacted by man and his backyard barbeque.
MMGW IS NOT "Settled Science" .......
I simply do not believe it. If you look at trends over the past several years (100's of years) you will see that the
whether trends from cool to warm. Labeling these changes as "Global Warming" is garbage. Global warming is
an excuse for government to tax, and "green" industries to profit. I agree that putting unnecessary pollutants in
to the atmosphere is bad for the sake of the enviroment as a whole, but to impose mandates and requirements
to become "green" on businesses, citizens, and local government in this economy is just plain stupid. We should
courage not require.
First, the fact that by all accounts, the Earth has been warmer and colder than today. Climate change was
occurring long before man entered the equation. 200 years ago, the Earth was under the influence of the Little
Ice Age. It takes little deduction to realize the response after a cold period will be a warming, duh! Atmospheric
CO2 is less than 4 parts per 10,000. Man's contribution of that total is 3%. Ocean evaporation, volcano eruptions
and forest fires dwarf human production of CO2. How does man get the blame when he has such a small
contribution (because man is the only contributor that can be regulated)? Finally, please provide the scientific
formula that proves CO2 causes warming. All studies indicate CO2 rises approx. 800 years AFTER the
temperature increases. That delegates the rise in CO2 an EFFECT not a CAUSE. Think about this.....during the
Medievil Warm Period (warmer than today), inhabitants were healthier than those who endured the Little Ice
Age. Plagues and sickness were much more prevalent during the LIA. Plants thrive on higher levels of CO2,
which is why greenhouse operations add more CO2 to the indoor climate. Animals and humans that ingest a
better quality of energy are naturally healthier. If man can make the climate warmer (he can't), then why can't
man make all the necessary changes to the climate to fit his ideal (rain, snow, heat, cold)? Remember, no
matter what man accomplishes, Mother Nature always bats last......and she is never discriminatory or shows any
favoritism to any comission or theory!
Lack of scientific proof linking human and natural earth changes.
Human-caused global warming is completely junk science. Carbon dioxide from human sources CANNOT be
proved to cause long term climate change. Water vapor and sun cycles affect climate 1,000,000 times more
than any fluctuation in carbon dioxide, which is required for ALL life on the planet. The entire climate change
strategy is a means for governments to increase taxation and redistribution of wealth, nothing more and nothing
less. Get real!!!
As an engineer and scientist, my review of the data does not support the conclusion of anthropogenic global
warming.
There does not seem to be an acknowledgment of historical change. In Central Oregon one could have an
orchard of fruit trees around the early 1900's and then it got colder and colder and growing fruit is difficult.
There was a lot of snow around Portland in the 1940s early 50s and then now seems to be increasing. In the
1980's not much thunder with the rain; now has increased. Listened to Terry Gross interview the man who set
up the timed cameras to record glaciers receding. His comment to her was -- look you are seeing the snowfall
from 1000 years ago. Well, if that is true, then it got colder in between then and now and we are just going
back to that time. One must acknowledge the change in the earth's shape that occurs each year which creates
change over the years.
As a science teacher with a degree in science, I know that the science behind global warming is flawed. For
example, CO2 only makes up 4/10,000 of the atmosphere, which is not nearly enough to significantly impact
the climate. More likely that solar activity or just an extension of the waning ice age is at work. As the director
of the environmental studies program at OSU said, "We drew the wrong conclusion from the data." It may take
years for the rest of you to admit it too, but I'm confident that you will eventually.
Biased "science"
History has proven that weather patterns have changed, in cycles. I truly think that the idea of global warming
has made a lot of people very wealthy; and these people know they aren't telling the truth.
My observation has shown that most if not all of the very outspoken climate change/global warming activists are
the ones with the most to gain from perpetuating a social fear and irrational reaction to the unproven supposition of causation.

There is probably more evidence that it is not true and that we are actually entering into a cooling cycle. These warming/cooling cycles have been going on for milleniums. Environmentalists use their tactics to prevent development.

I believe man has little impact on our climate. Many qualified scientists believe climate change is natural. A lot of SCIENTIFIC data exists to disprove the theory of Global Warming.

Being used to make money for people like Al Gore, selling carbon credits and having people be compensated for it is total bull. Go to China and tell them to stop using oil!

The fact that you lunatic liberals have to phony-up statistics to back up your hare-brained theories.

The climate has been changing forever. We have had tropical plants found as fossils in areas way too cold today to support such plants. Glaciers have carved valleys in areas that would melt glaciers quickly now.

Al Gore's theory has been denounced by a large majority of the scientific community, which is why we haven't heard anything out of him in quite a while. He, however, has made millions investing in "green" projects. The cap and trade tax which Congress is trying to force on us will only make money for politicians and cause many job losses. This calls for skepticism.

The belief in climate change is more a matter of sensibility than sense. It is a pretense, a cause célèbre, employed by adherents of the environmental movement to advance their agenda. The environmental movement couples a loathing of mankind with a Rousseauian aesthetic sensibility.

I see no difference in any significant change in the weather. I believe the earths weather pattern is in constant change and humans have a 0% impact. The "climate change" as you call it is a natural event and in light of the falsified documents produced in England and by American, so called, academics I believe the whole process is a corruption of true science to create some kind of perverted political agenda.

I am surrounded by highly educated scientists, and they are either "skeptical" or "not convinced." Also, in my own personal research, I have not found definitive proof of "Climate Change" or "Global Warming."

How much is "hype" and how much is actual, based on scientific information, not from Al Gore who is by far the biggest hypocrite re: his carbon footprint.

the scientific evidence does not support this theory. It's political, not actual.

being used as political ploy to increase government involvement and raise cost of energy to consumer and manufacturers

John Day Fossil Beds N.M is located in Grant County, and is a reminder of the earths natural evolution of climate.

Let's face it, there are people with an outside agenda to make money! Now it is "climate change", first it is "global warming". It is pandering to a group so a select group can make money! Look at Europe and their cap and trade programs. I lived there and it has made money for a few and there has been no improvement in "Climate Change". It is a hoax perpetuated by some elitest!

Simple, The earth changes all the time. In fact all one has to is study the history of our weather. Climate change is normal and has been going on since the beginning of time.

The facts are distorted. What makes man think he has such an impact on the climate? One volcano has a much greater impact.

That natural heating and cooling cycles have always occurred. Now the role of humans is being overly stressed by groups that have a specific environmental viewpoint.

its colder not warmer, id welcome warmer, id definitely welcome more sunlight

No proven science. Weather changes appear to be within normal cycles.

I feel it's more of a political agenda than anything else.

The patterns have been repeated for generations

People using it to push there agenda

It is now called climate change, it was gobal warming but we were not warming up. Now it is cimate change. Also alot of us feel the it is a ruse that is being used to shut down our factories and other industries. The fact is we need these to survive. All industry produces some type of pollutants but we need jobs to pay bills. We
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cannot shut the whole country down. I golf with a manager from Pacific Power. He told me that Our coal fire plants burn 99% clean and we use low sulfa coal. That by shutting these plants down our rates will sky rocket. Why do we still close them? Also it takes more gas to produce ethonal, Just use the gas. I see this as a attempt by the green people to push their own views. Use comon sense.

\[ n = 136 \]

**15. What leads you to think climate change is happening?**

Global temperatures have increased since 1850, after the coldest 600 years in the last 6,000. The research, but the credibility of the studies concern me. temps that have been tracked over time; the opinion of scientists who do this stuff for a living. The increasing average temperatures, the start of snowpack melt changing 4.8 days per decade, and the increasing unpredictability of the weather.

It's inevitable

Although I am not strong on hard sciences, I understand scientific theory and hypothesis. I also am willing to accept expert advice in areas which I am not strong in understanding. I don't understand how air conditioners work either and I don't need to. I understand climate change to be well documented and the greatest disagreement in the scientific community is regarding cause. Even there, the majority viewpoint is that the hypothesis that anthropogenic causes are a large contributing factor to the current rate of climate change.

Climates are changing with relation to how they have been in the past, however, we have only been recording weather patterns in relatively recent history. When things like carbon dating in ice in Antarctica are considered, we can see that the World has always had a history of fluctuation carbon dioxide levels. We are concerned now because we are in an upswing of carbon dioxide levels, which may or may not be related to human activities. Most people can safely assume there is an impact, but the question is how much of an impact.

Melting glaciers, rising sea levels, more intense storms like hurricanes & tornados, more drought in some regions, more rains and floods in other regions. Global wierding seems more descriptive than global warming.

Pollution

What convinces me was the frequency of freakishly intense rains that flooded many cities last year. Objective evidence and research from scientists, leaders, and other citizens. It is impossible for there to be as many people as are on this planet at this time and not have them effect the climate and the environment. Plus there is to much evidence that shows that the climate world wide has been change faster then ever before in the last 200 Years.

There is overwhelming scientific evidence that climate change is happening and human behavior is playing a large role in that change.

The science that supports CO2 emissions

Experts!

Weather extremes in locations outside of Oregon

The data and the radical weather shifts around the country and the world. I think we need to plant trees. We as a human race have deforessted Scotland for a war and it never recovered. We have taken out a lot of our huge trees in Oregon. I care a lot about that. I think that the idea of "carbon trading" is ripe for abuse.

change in weather patterns over time

Drier conditions in Oregon, increase in severe weather events, retreat of glaciers and melting of Arctic and Antarctic ice caps.

Lots of science to support that theory

The melting of glaciers and other ice areas, more flooding, and other strong changes in weather.

scientific data on carbon dioxide in atmosphere

On a worldwide scale it seems more extreme events occur, such as last years flooding in Europe and repeated droughts there. Observing overall trends in snowpack, glacial and sea ice, and warming in many areas.

Melting ice caps on north and south pole, endangered polar bears, reduced snow pack in Cascades, quick melts in spring, extreme weather patterns - tornados, heat waves, freezing cold spells across several states.

Weather pattern changes throughout the world. More hurricanes, tornadoes and other severe weather. Flooding
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or drought. All on one end or another.
I trust science and scientists more than ideologues
media & academic info
World weather craziness, gradual increase in global temperatures as measured in trends.
see previous answer regarding weather; buildup of GHGs over decades of industrialization and consumerism
polar ice is melting, more intense storms and drought
some of the data supports evidence that climate change is happening, however, the extent to which changes are
human caused have me asking questions and doubting some of the information provided in the mainstream
media
overpopulation
We don’t seem to have much here, but I do recognize our winters being longer in the past couple of years.
glacial melting
Climate change has been happening since the earth was formed. The rate of change varies, but never stops.
what I’ve read
It seems as though summers are warmer everywhere.
All around the planet the weather is becoming more dramatic
Global Warming is a hoax. It is NOT happening. Climate Data that, NOT skewed by Global Warming alarmists,
clearly indicates that our climate cycles are natural and that changes in climate are naturally cycle.
reports as from Union of Concerned Scientists, physicians for social responsibility, Oregon State University’s
center on climate change (Phil Mote et al), U of Oregon’s initiative, Gary Braasch, occasional TV specials. . .
Truth
Data
I do NOT believe there is any climate change; it is a hoax drummed up by environmentalists. I have kept
weather records for 37 years on my ranch and have observed weather cycles as they seem to come and go on a
fairly regular basis.
weather extremes, wide fluctuations in temps, precip and season lengths
Reading the vast scientific literature on it, and even some of the harder to find literature claiming it isn’t
happening
Changes in plants and animal locations - earlier blooming, etc.
The arctic.
Mainly the news I hear from the Arctic area, south American glacier melting, increased heavy rainfall and fires
around the globe.
Media
listening to experts and reading about it. I'm convinced that the planet has heated up on average by one degree
faranheit in the last 50 years, which has far reaching affects. I've seen pictures of glaciers receding. Also climate
change is better labeled climate chaos as weather patterns are becoming increasingly harder to predict.
I think that it makes sense that we would have an impact on the environment and even if we're wrong, the
worst case scenario is that we conserve resources. I don't see how that's a bad thing to do. It seems like there
has been pretty accurate proof. I realize that things move in cycles and this might happen anyway but the
people who are trying to debunk it are the same people who seem to be on the wrong side of everything else I
care about.
Scientific evidence.
Weather is surprising people all over the world. Tsunamis and natural disasters appear to me to be increasing
(although maybe not really)
Scientific presentations linking climate change to the activities of mankind.
climatic change occurs naturally over time, for all we know we could be causing global cooling. Carbon release
into the atmosphere by humans is definitely causing terrible pollution, as well as destroying vast tracts of
forest life. Climate change is inevitable as the earth orbits the sun.
I dont think it has changed I think it has gotten more variable
**Why do you care so much about climate change?**

Because I believe the sustainability of the planet is at stake.

I fear this country has major problems with large system changes and upheavals, which is what will be required of us when our global weather patterns change and we need to feed ourselves.

Because climate change will: 1) severely impact our ability to grow staple crops and provide food on the table. 2) reduce species diversity and habitat and increase likelihood of diseases, vectors, and infestations. 3) cause more severe weather leading to damaged infrastructure, casualties, and food and habitat destruction.

I care because it is affecting everyone on this planet, and the effects could be truly devastating. Our nation is leading cause of carbon emissions, so we ought to focus more on decreasing our impact.

I care about how it will effect the livability of Oregon for my children (ages 11 and 13), and how it will effect the livability for others growing up here now and in the future.

Human (particularly American) patterns of natural resource depletion, and ever-increasing global population—tripled in my lifetime!—is completely unsustainable. We are careening towards a collapse of unprecedented proportions, yet we lack the collective will to moderate our consumption habits. Our values appear to be shortsighted, selfish and self-destructive; it's all very demoralizing...

because many regions of the world are likely to be drastically effected, causing crop failures & harsher living conditions which would further aggravate the situation for billions of people in struggling countries and no doubt lead to mass migration away from the equator to already over populated countries in more temperate regions which are already struggling to maintain their quality of life.

because it will change the world we live in, and who knows what that means for our children. I want a world where my kids can still run around outside, play in the streams/lakes/riders.

It affects everyone on the planet and has stark consequences for both today and future generations. We will start to see severe impacts within my lifespan, and do not even know yet how it will affect future generations.

Historically the earth has seen extreme weather patterns without any influence of human activity so we should expect the changes to be more drastic because of our impact on the atmosphere, water and land. Even though scientific predictions of the impacts of climate change are improving - I think that the enormity of the problem is still underestimated in the general population. I care so much because humans have evolved to dominate the planet rather than live as part of the complex system and honestly it may be too late to reverse our negative impact.

This is truly the problem of a generation- at this point we cannot stop the actual climate change that is going to occur, unless we can pull GHGs out of the atmosphere which I am skeptical will become possible. Thus I fear for my own future and that of my children, because there is very little political will currently on a national/global scale to make the drastic changes needed to limit the effects of global warming. Shortsightedness now is going to do great harm to us later, I believe.

I care about the ability of species to thrive, about future generations of human and non-human species, and about how our lifestyles affect the planet

Because we will destroy our food system and our habitat. Environmental disasters impact us all financially, socially and as a nation weakens us all (not to mention what it does to places around the planet).

It will have devastating economic impacts, especially on the poor. Also degrade the quality of life for all.

Because it is an issue that is going to affect everyone and something needs to be done immediately to make the world a livable place for our children

It will change how we live and what we do - what we grow, the water available for human and animal consumption, wildlife, flowers, air pollution

i'd like my kids to be able to enjoy the outdoors as much as i do. we've only got one earth and we need to make it last (in a condition that people can coexist with it.)

Because it is changing our environment significantly. I want my daughter to have healthy air and water and access to our beautiful outdoor areas. The glaciers are receding; habitat is being eroded for animals; increased forest fires and flooding.... The list is long.

it's affecting everything we do, what we eat, how we live, where we live
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Because I do believe the scientists who say we are having a significant effect on the earth. I think that it is largely due to how we live, but also due to the amount of humans who actually live that way. Global overpopulation multiplies the impacts of people who do not live an environmentally responsible lifestyle.

it has potential to change Oregon and other areas in devastating and irreparable ways - I’m concerned about local biodiversity, forest health, habitat maintenance, water supply quality and quantity/consistency, growing crops, the livelihood of many Oregonians, and equity

Because of what it means for the future of our planet, not limited to the effects on our species

I don't have time to list all the reasons, but suffice to say that climate change could fundamentally alter--and not for the better--basic environmental conditions that we humans and all life depend on. We could leave our descendants a terribly diminished world. And those people who worry that our economy will be damaged if we tackle climate change should remember that the economy depends entirely on the environment; the only way to prosper economically is to live sustainably, and that includes aggressively combatting climate change.

We are causing irreversible dame t the earth that will negatively affect ourselves and future generations. Making positive changes to correct this is just the right thing to do and worth the cost to our lazy lifestyles and pocketbooks.

I know it’s real and happening now. I fear that we’re already too late, that all the changes afoot are from our activities years ago, so our activities today haven’t even begun to take effect. I care because I am a Mother and would wish clean air and clean water for my child, but that is not what she is inheriting. We have totally overdone it.

A stable climate is critical to our survival, not to mention our lifestyles. Access to food and water will be complicated and extreme weather more common. I care about climate change because I’m frightened.

I care about climate change so much because I am very knowledgeable about it and know we are all completely unprepared for it. Without preparation there are going to be consequences that many places and people will not be able to cope with.

Intergenerational justice; affects me in the future.

for future generations

Climate change threatens life on Earth at all levels and it is not a necessary change, at least at the rate it is occurring. At this point in time, it is mainly an issue of comfort of life in the US, but for other countries / areas it is getting to be a life threatening issue: flooding, drought, decreasing habitat for wildlife. We are here to co-exist, to appreciate life around us and to promote health and well being for all levels of life and all natural structures all without grabbing more than our 'share'. It sounds preachy, and I don't mean to be, but we should be stewards, passing it on in the same or a better condition for everyone, not just to our families and not just as it pertains to lifestyle and consumption. I need to get off my soapbox!!

So many people and wildlife will be affected. It is a change like humans have never seen before on a grand scale and it will be devastating for many species, including humans

The science is ignored by politicians and lobbyists. The process has a very long "tail" and given the ignorance on display, the problem will have to be very bad before the well paid deniers can be controlled. It will take an Oakland north interface fire in very expensive suburbs to scare some sense into the public debate.

I have found that my relationship with the environment has become of utmost importance in my life. Growing up, I wouldn't say I was particularly aware. But as I have gotten older, I am beginning to realize the great injustice we as a people are committing to the earth. We have one planet and it sustains us and allows us to enjoy wonderful lives. It only makes sense that we care for it as it has cared for us. My commitment towards helping create a greener and healthier future has led me to major in environmental policy. I am excited about the future.

I am deeply concerned about the future and likelihood of increased natural disasters, droughts, floods, and
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changes in climate that might decrease our ability to grow food in the Willamette Valley. I’m one of the few who realizes how deeply we are tied to the climate - culturally/socially and economically. The disruptions will be tremendous. I also like our current planet, and am not willing to give up all of the wonderful things about it.

intergenerational tyranny; disproportionately impacts the poorest of the world; vanishing and permanently altered natural and living resources
Humans only live by adapting to the earth and their regional environment, there’s only so much we can adapt it without ruining the chances of earth's inhabitants. We've gone too far in modifying our earth and have less and less control.

Because how human beings respond to climate change really defines who we ultimately are; because our response will determine our ability to survive and/or respect ourselves and eachother.

Because it will have a profound effect on our lives, and on the lives of future generations, in terms of the cost and availability of goods and services
The science points to substantially changed environments in the near future, yet public actions to date to prepare for that future are inadequate.

How can I not? I live on THIS planet. I love this Earth. I have worked for 35 years to prevent this global crisis, and ache that we haven't done what I've felt we needed to to prevent the many impacts our changing climate is having on people throughout the world.

long term effects on livability in the region and globally. impacts my desire to move somewhere south/warmer for my partner’s sake (he hates the wet weather here)-I fear lack of regional sustainability, and water in those places in the long run (SE/SW USA).

- concerned about the future of living in Oregon, especially close to rivers - general concern about an increase global climate and the significant loss of species, more extreme weather conditions - humans should not think of ourselves as being any more important than other species on the planet... but we certainly do
Our lives are interdependent on the environment around us, and our species will not survive without a more integrated world view, such as saving bees.

The impacts of climate change are significant and costly in many ways. Being an Earth scientist, I have watched a revolution in understanding of climate science develop. The impacts of changes over past 150 years are clear to those who really know the data and the future projections based on vastly improved climate models are daunting, I know that humans are interconnected and interdependent. I also know that my carbon emissions and those of my community will most directly affect others first, especially the world's most poor and vulnerable communities. I can't with good conscience wait until the impact is a personal felt need to work for change.

sustaining world populations (food water) and my own and my family’s quality of life
Because humans can have a direct impact on the progression or cessation of climate change as a result of their behaviors & choices.

Because it's a slow-moving global catastrophe. Effects on the PNW will be as damaging as anywhere: drier forests and more fires, diminished habitat, extreme storms, changes in snowfall and snowmelt, increased in-migration of water refugees from other parts of the country, and on and on.

I view this issue more broadly as being about overconsumption and the reduction/degradation of a variety of resources, including water, air quality, energy sources, components such as steel/aluminum, etc., and renewable resources such as plant life.

I am concerned about how it will negatively impact different regions globally, fearful of increased fighting over dwindling natural resources (water, etc.), the changing weather and/or ocean current impacts that could result in severe weather that destroys densely (human) populated areas. And I’m concerned about people moving to Oregon because we may not be as highly impacted. I love the state as it is, I don't want it to turn into an overpopulated, resource depleted area (like some of California).

Because we can do something about. Humans are affecting it and we have the ability to lessen that affect. If we don't move quickly, we won't be around to argue about it.

Because I love all of life and am responsible for my actions
I believe it will affect world stability and make life difficult for my children and grandchildren.
Because it’s not just "climate" change--it's Earth change, society change, family change. Because it fundamentally will alter what Oregon is and how we live here. Because it amounts to a face transplant in terms of geographic
Appendix N: Survey - Responses to Open Ended Questions

identity--beaches will go away; there will be more tsunami exposure; rivers will rage more in winter and dwindle more in summer, even as our needs for water sky-rocket to irrigate our crops in warmer summers and satisfy a growing population, swelled by climate refugees from the American Southwest; our mountain snows will diminish, and signature glaciers disappear (leaving Mt. Hood looking like a Mexican volcano, dusty purple with a lens of white on top); native species will go extinct; wildfires will go mega, burning through swaths of forest and rangeland each summer at a pace and scale we haven't seen before. The Oregon I've known and loved is terminal. The Oregon to-come will doubtless still have charms, but we will have leveled-down to a shockingly different state--in place and mind.

Because IF this is primarily the result of human activity (I believe this and I believe that things change, including weather patterns - so it's not just ONE factor) then we humans (particularly Western developed nations) are horrible stewards of a beautiful place and we are taking on a lot of karma for disrupting the habitat and wellbeing of thousands of species.

because it is disastrous. the slow changes that are happening don't seem to affect us, but then hit us very hard all at once

As the predominant species on earth in terms of influence on the natural environment, we have a responsibility to be good stewards. If we want to maintain a livable planet that is healthy for people, animals, plants, birds, fish, insects, and the rest of God's creation, we are going to have to make sacrifices and take meaningful action to stop global warming.

I do not believe we have dominion over the planet. I find that naive. People seem to want to deny that humans are a part of the ecosystem.

Because it's going to have an impact on every aspect of our lives. Food, weather patterns, human health.

We (all earth organisms) only have one planet. We shouldn't wreck it.

Because it's human caused mostly and we can do something about it.

I am very concerned that we take care of the planet for future generations.

Climate will continue to change. This will increase the probability of "unnatural events" such as prolonged drought, increased frequency and intensity of wildfires, big storms and flood events. Coastal erosion will increase and greater amounts of public dollars will be shunted to repair damages, and emergencies both statewide and FEMA and less will be channeled into those other services that we need. Agriculture will be badly affected, not only in terms of changes in growing season in relation to water supply, but pests from the southern countries will expand their range. I suspect that marine and salmon fisheries will be affected and food shortages will occur. Tropical diseases such as Dengue Fever are now established in the south and the mosquitos that carry them will also spread north. More dollars will be distributed to public health to cope with disease outbreaks and control of outbreaks of new invasive diseases.

for the ability of less advantaged people to survive; for adequate drinking and irrigation water supplies; for adequate food supplies and quality of life for future generations; for the survival of healthy ecosystems and forests in the natural world, including endangered, threatened or potentially endangered species.

People will starve. The changing climate will have a strong deleterious affect on agriculture, with crops in this country failing due to floods, droughts, cold springs, etc. It will change the earth as we know it, deforesting large parts, supporting fewer birds, plants, fish, etc. Along with energy descent and this failing economy, our whole lives will change, and pretty soon, too.

I’d like for people to live on the planet without changing it.

I know that it could mean the demise of our civilization, eventually. You can't keep using up resources and adding to our population the way we have done up to this point.

Because it is real

We have only one planet that we all live on together. How we all treat that planet affects us all and future generations and all the species that live here.

I think that climate change is part of a natural cycle. What concerns me is unhealthy human activity that upsets nature’s rhythms. Toxins in the waterways don’t disappear just because they are washed downstream. Soil doesn’t cleanse itself of pesticides and chemical fertilizers. Millions of pounds of trash and garbage take up valuable land and plastic waste increases surface temperatures. If people are REALLY willing, we can break our bad habits and be in better sync with the earth.

Honestly, I feel bad for the animals that are going to suffer because of climate change. I think some of the causes of climate change are natural, but I feel like most of the causes are due to human activity. There are too many of
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us, and we tend to ruin the planet with very little concern for how it will impact the many other species we share it with.
Because humans have a hard enough time maintaining peace without environmental stressors.
Climate change has a huge impact on my children & children's children future. I fear for their future and our ability to provide for them as our world has provided for us.
Unpredictable changes to biodiversity, food systems and distribution of fresh water
I care somewhat what deeply. Too old to get really wound up. But clearly life over the globe will change. Most heart wrenching would be crop failures and water failures especially in already struggling/impoverished areas. It affects everything -- water supplies, air quality, and it also affects all living things not just humans -- it is all encompassing
It has a profound effect on the wildlife's existance, the natural resources, future life as we know it and most of all the impact it will have on my children, grand-children etc, etc, etc!!!
Because it will drastically affect our world in a very negative way.
I understand the far-reaching impacts it will cause on biodiversity and human health.
Because it will impact life on earth, both natural and human
Climate change has been caused by human overpopulation and the stupid American greed/consumption/competition/production ethic in a capitalistic economy without decent regulation. Our political atmosphere is pro-business profit at all costs rather than pro-environment and pro-citizen. I advocate cooperation, voluntary simplicity, regulation of emissions from polluters, investment in green energy, and stimulus of alternative energy jobs.
The effect it is having on our environment.
Because I'm informed! I can't believe the deniers! I despair that the monied interests pretend that our way of life is not endangered! ALL other issues pale in the presence of the threat facing us of droughts, fires, floods, rising seas and dying seas, disrupted ecosystems, and pollution. The human race is well on the way to committing suicide. I'm 76; I'm living in paradise compared to what's coming. But I want my grandchildren to have a world that is beautiful as it has been and still (barely) is.
All life is dependent on the natural resources. No clean air, water, good soil and jobs don't make a difference; money doesn't make a difference. I am concerned about the loss of diversity that comes with climate change.
Because I worry about how horribly we are affecting our earth. I worry about how long we will be able to live in this changing earth, and how the climate will affect our lives. I wonder how we should change what we do every day so that we can stop or slow down all the horrible things we have done to the earth. I wish there was a way to make people understand and stop being so greedy and only care about how much money they make today, instead of whether our children and grandchildren will be able to survive.
Don't like to see things die and suffer.
well, its really a matter of fairness for those who aren't able to adapt. Here in Oregon, we can adapt (it won't be easy but we can) where for some people and animals without the right tools it can be devastating.
The impact on wildlife and native plants.
I believe the science. We can't continue putting toxins into the air and expect everything to go on as it has in the past. Although I haven't noticed a climate change here, Hawaii is drier and so is Africa.
It will most likely lead to the end of advanced civilization.
I am concerned about more 100 degree summer days, monsoon wet seasons, water shortages in late summer, no more Pinot noir in Oregon and less snowpack.
I see global climate change as the single most important issue we face. The certainty of what climate change will bring, coupled with the uncertainty of what climate change might bring, will affect every aspect of our lives.
Life as we know it will not be possible if chaos becomes the new climate.
While I know there will be painful effects for us, here, and our children in years to come, I realize that there are parts of the world where people who already struggle to exist, will find life as they know it, impossible. Entire ecosystems may disappear, or change dramatically. Species eradication and desertification are bound to occur. Because I understand that it will drastically alter the world we live in today, affecting food security, water security, habitat for wildlife, ecosystem services, and biodiversity, among other things.
As part of my research on climate change impacts to freshwater systems in the Pacific Northwest, I am very aware
that climate change is (and will) alter our environment. These changes will affect our water sources and the water needed to support ecosystem functioning. I believe it is our responsibility to combat climate change and make steps to reverse the damage already incurred.

because of the effects it will have on species - range shifts, extinctions, etc

I have known about the effect of greenhouse gases on the average world temperature and climate since the 1960s. In the intervening 55 years I have seen little or no effort to actually do anything about it, and an enormous amount of obstruction used whenever attempts have been made to do something about it.

I care about Human-enduced climate change. I care about the complex and far-reaching changes it can have to our environment and so to our way of life.

we are losing it, my children are going to miss a lot of things i learned and encountered in nature and wildlife. The population is gaining the upper hand in global climate outcomes that will not be reversible. No ice caps, what will we do? get a grip people

We only have one viable planet to live on. To me, it trumps all other political issues. We don't need to worry about education, health care, immigration or whose president, if we have made our planet unsafe or uninhabitable due to our careless choices of how we treat our planet. We act without regard for how decisions will impact the planet in the future. Short term thinking with long range consequences concerns me. Also decisions are made usually with the greatest profit motivation usually winning. I don't think maximum profit or GNP should be the most important thing when critical decisions about our environment are being made. Again, I see planet care as trumping all other issues. We are soiling our next, so to speak - something that even animals take care around.

I have a child. It is wrong to change the natural order of things for short term benefit of a few greedy humans.

Because it is going to change my life and the lives of future generations

Because part of the contribution is the result of the way humans live and some things we do are just not sustainable and not very smart. Most of them are discretionary so we can make changes. We should make changes.

Because it will increase the rate of species extinction and will be very expensive for human societies to adjust to the new realities.

Human civilization is ultimately dependent on a stable ecosystems. Human activity has altered climate in such a fundamental way that the persistence of life as we know it is threatened. Our children and myriad other species will pay the price.

We are destroying our planet.

The growing season for food production and water issues

I think it is the hieght of arrogance for humans to think we can destroy other species and destroy the complex systems of the earth just for our comfort or corporate profit. We may be making the planet uninhabitable for our species.

We need to act as stewards of our planet for future generations and for other species.

The potential impacts climate change poses on proper ecosystem functioning, then maintenance of our biodiversity and the ability of our natural systems to sustain our human community.

because I have a child

Because our world is changing and not all for the better. More erratic weather occurrences and stronger storms. Impact on people and plants and animals.

local and global impacts on livelihoods.

The results of it are so destructive. Also, there will be increasing finanacial costs associated with it. Just ask the insurance companies.

I know it is a real issue that will significantly affect the earth's climate and its inhabitants if we don't do something about it. But with all the industrialization and development going on in the world, I wonder if we can ever change the course before it is too late.

Because I'm worried about the world my kids will live in; because I am concerned about our food and water supply (particularly water); because I believe climate change will increase conflict and competition over scarce resources and lead to global instability.

It greatly impacts our species ability to exist on this planet, not to mention all other species besides homo sapien.

Because I believe we are headed towards the unnecessary destruction of our ecosystem. Due to greed, we are going to accidentally destroy ourselves by ruining the ecosystem that supports our lives and keeps us alive. I
would like my children and grandchildren to experience the same beauty, quality of life and planetary diversity that I enjoyed.

Negative affects on quality of life for myself, family, and others. Increased heat stress in summer. Loss of snow pack, which is important water source to our rivers and salmon (and skiing :-) Likely to create greater instability and suffering in the world.

Our planet is changing faster than our politics. Just as we are using more and more resources, less and less are available and using them is creating increased and more severe natural disasters. Regardless of whether these disasters are considered to be linked to global warming or climate change, we need to put in place emergency preparedness and have all community projects go through a climate change filter using the advice of scientists. For example I live in Lake Oswego. We will be doubling the size of our water treatment facility. In this process we are ignoring climate change considerations and other considerations relative to the impacts of nature such as earthquakes and we are spending over a quarter of a billion dollars to build a system that will be obsolete as soon as it is finished because those things were not considered. Conservation instead of enlargement, seismic risk abatement with the pipe under the river and with steel reservoirs rather than concrete, use of gravity to save energy, and using local water from the Willamette as a less expensive and alternative source so that redundancy is provided if the Clackamas source is a problem such as from reduced runoff in late summer all should be considered by climate change and risk analysis scientists. I would like to see the services of scientists provided to community leaders as described in the book by Mark Hertsgaard, "Hot - Living Through The Next Fifty Years on Earth" and the State of Oregon mandate that counties and government have each major project affecting the future of a generation of Oregonians use climate change as a filter for all decisions. Consideration of the impact of 100 year floods by the middle of the century will be valid only for 20 year floods when looking at tidally affected rivers such as the Willamette at Portland and Lake Oswego. Obviously consideration of 100 year flooding needs to be adjusted to consider climate change impacts. I think that climate change is going to greatly impact biodiversity and disrupt civilization.

Probably because I started reading Lester Brown and the Worldwatch Institute reports in 1985 and so am pretty well educated on the facts. Also, I have an irrational fondness for the human species and would like to see it survive. Along with a human-friendly ecosystem and the country I grew up in.

Many reasons: sense of responsibility to those most affected, future generations, sense of loss for natural systems and individual forms of life affected by our actions.

If the climate really is affected, the future of the world as I know it will change -- and it appears possible that the future of mankind may be in doubt.

Because it affects everything and everyone, including wildlife, the economy, all ecosystems everywhere.

I'm concerned about how this will affect our health and the health of our children.

It is happening. I read about the glaciers melting. It will be catastrophic. There will also be health issues. We can't put it back and fix it.

Disappearing habitats and the plants and animals that depend upon them. More frequent and intense storms across the nation are frightening and the cost is staggering. I fear my grand children will experience a very different and harsher landscape and climate, bear the cost of adaptation, and may not be able to connect with or appreciate nature.

The scale at which humans are transforming global carbon cycles is unprecedented in the history of the planet. H. sapiens is the most unique creature to emerge from the surface of our planet with a seemingly super-natural capacity of planetary terraformation. Our activity is creating a new line of discontinuity for the geologic record similar to those in Earth's history where things like massive extinctions of biological life are associated. So, things like massive extinctions of biological life.

It not only will affect me but the next generations to come.

I'm afraid the planet is going to crash to uninhabitability, and that we may have already passed the tipping point. because people don't get the importance of these actions brought on by themselves.

How can you listen to Bill McKibbon and read Greg Craven (What's the Worst that Could Happen? A Rational Response to the Climate Change Debate) and not be scared silly at how bad off we denizens of planet Earth are already?

Because of the potential impacts to low lying areas around the world, and the increased potential of forest fires and the impacts on agriculture. Plus, I believe we can figure out ways to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases we generate, as well as ways to absorb those gases.
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Because those who will be most affected are not in positions of power to do something about it. Climate change is a symptom of a much larger imbalance, and much of that is due to a dependence on energy to support and unsustainable consumptive lifestyle, that only a few in the world benefit from and participate in, but which most people are aspiring to. We need to change our aspirations.

I fear the impact climate change is going to have on the environment, including wildlife, plant life and my lifestyle! It affects the quality of life. More heat and different weather patterns. It affects peoples lives and their livelihoods. Drier summers contribute to more forest fires, more CO2 in the air and more trouble breathing for many.

I am now 36 and getting married this year & plan to have a family in the near future. I would like my kids to grow up knowing what a wonderful, beautiful place this world really is and can be. And I’d like their children to know this place as we know it now. I already know it will be a different experience than my own childhood.

Quality of life. Basics like availability of drinking water, adequate food crops.

Dramatic changes/destuction of ecosystems upon which humankind, worldwide, depends

The future of all plant and animal species on this wonderful DEMAND that we do something about it immediately. Individuals and leaders need to attend to this most urgent problem now.

because we are destroying our planet slowly but surely and people don’t seem to care or want to change. All it takes is little steps and it’s easy to do!

Because it threatens extinction of many, many life forms on this planet, including human life. We could get to the point Venus did, with runaway global warming that eliminates almost all life on the planet, and certainly changes earth’s environment so drastically that it is no longer the planet we know and evolved upon, no longer a planet that can support human life. If we avoid those consequences, global climate change is already producing significant changes in habitat and climate that are already driving many species to relocate or go extinct. Current global climate change is one of the factors contributing to the current mass extinction event that the living creatures of our planets are experiencing. Global climate change is already producing more extreme, disastrous weather events, and reducing water supplies to a dangerous point. Here in Oregon, we are losing the kind, temperate climate we have previously enjoyed. Drought and wildfire are becoming more problematic. Global climate change and the peaking of fossil fuels will also force changes in our food supply -- and threaten it.

The future of the human population depends a great deal on these changes.

Climate change affects all living things. We should be most concerned about climate change caused by human activities.

I lived in Interior ALASKA for the past 15 years where climate changes and the effects of global warming are very real and occurring at an accelerated pace. The glaciers are indeed melting, the polar bear habitat - sea ice is recceeding and the tundra is for a fact is impacted by melting perma frost. I am graduate in Natural Resource Management- dedicated my life to “Mother Earth” in 1976 and my last gainful employment experience was with the Northern Alaska Environmental Center in Fairbanks, AK.

Humans and wildlife will not survive some types of possible climate change. Even survivable changes will be catastrophic; especially as governments (general managers of the Common Weal) do not appear to be willing to prepare and implement prevention, preemption, amelioration, mitigation, crisis management, nor restoration. Some even cling to denial. Once the ecosystem’s ability to function is broken, survival as we’ve known it is out of our control. Chaos and suffering.

This is the only planet that we know of that has life (as we know it). We humans are supposedly the superior species on Earth, yet we don’t,as a group, have the sense to not dirty the air, water or land. I despair that all we can do is adapt as best we can...because we won't have a choice if we wish to survive. We have a choice now to prevent the worst of the forecasts. Yet denial and greed for what we can consume today ranks higher than saving for the future. We’ll be hoisted on our own pittard...as a species....whether or not we all agree.

I think it is the defining issue of our time. There is no greater threat to our future health and well being -- and the well being of future generations. Because the changes are subtle compared to the mortgage crisis for example, it is hard to get people's attention. Most political institutions are not taking a strong enough leadership stance. I am a professional in the conservation industry and know firsthand how much opportunity there is to reduce waste, both in what we use, and how we use it (manufacturing and behavior change).

I believe we’re at risk of making the planet unlivable. There are already many species extinctions occurring.

I am concerned for our future. I am concerned about clean air to breathe, clean water to drink. I see some species of flowers going away. I think we should be more like Am. Indians and start thinking at least 6 generations ahead. Currently our politicians cannot get anything passed that is controversial or affects Corporations bottom line as they have to start campaigning 2 years into their term. After college grad. I moved to Oregon because of Oregon's
progressive land use/conservation laws. Let's stick to them.

It's in our own interest to be concerned about not affecting vital natural systems upon which we depend. The earth will continue without us just fine, but human civilizations will find it harder to thrive or even survive if we continue pumping green house gases into the atmosphere. The biggest problem is not that we don't have technical solutions or that we don't know what should be done, but rather that there are still corporate spread lies and disinformation campaigns persuading a large segment of the population and elected representatives who continue to deny the problem exists.

Indicative of problems that have long-lasting implications--impact on farming, air quality.

We are destroying our world at an alarming rate because we are so wasteful and selfish:) I care because I would like to leave the world in a decent state for future generations. I don't want to have extreme weather phenomena that costs lives and dollars. I want other species to live. I care because everything is connected and affected by climate change, from the economy to tourism to quality of life, etc. What we ("developed" nations) do affects the whole world in a very negative way.

I want to live, and I esp want to make positive changes for the benefit of the young.

We are responsible to the whole planet. Our contribution to melting ice caps directly affects millions of people living near sea level. Our contribution to warmer drier climate effects millions of people living in areas with inadequate water for agriculture. Even though most of these victims lives outside of Oregon and the US not all do. We have a moral obligation to mitigate ongoing and increasing damages associated with climate change.

Whether it's human-caused, nature-caused or (most-likely) some combination of both, it is real and we have to understand how to live with the new climates. I also care very much that we address real problems and not symptoms. If we spend all our available resources trying to reduce CO2 emissions and it fails to have any impact, we would have been better off trying to figure out how to adapt to the new "normal."

Irreversible effects on flora and fauna, severe weather patterns affecting the United States

It affects everyone -- but especially the poorest people -- and it's a HUGE problem that could seriously affect all of us.

It IS displacing people and their livelihoods. The wind and water and fires worldwide have been devastating. We must live in harmony with the earth by changing our habits.

I feel that protecting the earth for future generations is very important. We've already seen so much devastation from natural disasters, I would hate to think we have contributed to them in any way.

it has something to do about every thing we do

I love nature. I believe that what makes the environment - plants, animals, birds, rivers, oceans, etc. - sick or healthy, will also make me sick or healthy, as it will the people I love, the communities I depend on, the world I live in. We and our world are intertwined. If we want to have a happy, healthy life, we have to have a healthy planet. Earth is running a temperature; we must help it get well.

Legacy. I'd like to leave this world a better place for my kids. It's the "seventh generation" philosophy.

I am convinced that we have irrevocably changed the earth's ability to handle our human presence. Read Bill McKibben's Eaarth. I imagine great sociological upheaval as shortages of water and food and living space become more widespread. I don't like violence but that's what I foresee.

One of the subjects put forth at the start of this survey was the economic climate in Oregon. Many proposed actions that attempt to regulate atmospheric climate change can have a severe negative impact on our economic climate change. We now have numerous accounts of "scientists" deliberately skewing and manufacturing climate data to "prove" that humans are causing climate change. We need to make wise decisions when considering actions that will curtail productivity and not take actions based on questionable theories like anthropomorphic global warming.

Climate change affects humanity and the balance of nature in a myriad of ways and those in the most precarious of circumstances appear to be suffering the most. Intense droughts followed by massive floodings in Africa and Australia, the loss of ice masses in the Antarctic, devastating insect infestations in the Canadian forests, the all - important honeybee colonies being wiped out in the US...the list goes on and on. Pretending that man isn't harming the planet with our excesses and emissions is political theatre directed by those who have the most to gain from exploiting natural resources and the most to lose if they are forced to behave more responsibly. Yes, mother nature can implode all on her own and has done so many times over the millenia. But now we are accelerating processes that should occur over 100s or 1000s of years, not in mere decades. We disregard our own follies at our own risk and at the risk of our descendants.
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We are the caretakers for our earth. The generations to come will be affected by our lack of attention or, for many, lack of concern about the long-term affects of our actions (or inaction).

I have children, who will have to deal with what we leave to them

I've studied the science and I believe the experts. Every major national scientific academy agrees that this warming is our own doing, and one recent survey of publishing climatologists shows 98 percent agreement among them. In addition, how can one not be concerned about half of Arctic sea ice disappearing in the past fifty years? As a kid, I climbed glaciers in the Three Sisters that are much smaller now. I've watched the northward sweep of pine beetles for four decades. Last year was tied for hottest with 2005, in the hottest decade, following two other hottest decades. The evidence is clear.

It affects everyone. But humans are barely causing it. Yes we have an affect, but the warming is coming from within the earth. And if you look at National Geographic charts on Greenland and Antarctic ice core samples...we are at the top of a cyclic warming that has happened many times before. We may be accelerating it though.

I think it will cause great social dislocation worldwide.

I know for a fact that humans are contributing. Yes, we may be on an upswing in overall climate temp change, but humans are not only using limited resources, but actually omitting carbon into the atmosphere. That can be measured. So if we are having an increase in the temp of the atmosphere, we sure as heck shouldn't be adding to it more.

It is the end of the Earth

Climate change is a reality. As a person who understands statistics, I realize that the day to day weather is one of the last places a person should look in order to determine if it's a reality. Most of all 600 glaciers around the world have been in retreat for decades, except for a few in Antarctica. The tundra to our north has been retreating for decades. The flora and fauna have been shifting to cooler climates around the world. Some haven’t been able to shift fast enough to prevent extinction. The carbon in the air is over 300 ppm, that is parts per million, the most in over two million years. Before the industrial revolution the carbon ppm was around 75. Five per cent of all mankind are alive on earth at the present time generating carbon, and causing mass extinction. Considering all of the above, and much, much more, we are in uncharted territory. Since we know so little about the climate, a person can not say that we aren't having a negative impact on the climate from our perspective.

Massive impacts on my career (ski industry) -- some of which is already happening. An ironic fact that most people don’t realize is that too much snow can have nearly as much negative economic impact on snowsport tourism economies as too little. Too much snow also overwhelms state budgets for plowing, road maintenance, etc. leading to long-term issues. On a family level I worry about the issues my children will face in coming decades. But I admit some of my worry over CC is mitigated by the on-going realities of resource depletion (primarily peak oil, but also gas-coal-uranium) which will cause just as many new problems as help solve CC issues. Mainly I care because I have accepted that the powers of the world have manipulated the issue so much that there is no chance of truly meaningful action. The political process is gamed. The media is rigged. Our sub-set of generational imbalances worsen the situation (denial of CC is a card-carrying attribute of the Baby Boom and older crowd -- same folks that eat up the bile of Faux "News" with a spoon). We are doomed to run off the cliff as much as our resource supply will allow. Even as we go off the cliff the denial will continue.

Because I feel that we as a human race can do something to stop it but we don’t seem willing to make the necessary changes. There are so many small things that each of us can do that will have a large impact. I feel as if our time to have that impact and turn the tide is running out. I worry for my grandchildren. We have been given a beautiful planet and we need to become better stewards.

we have ruined Mother Earth and it may be too late to fix the damage. with the Koch Brothers and the GOP trying to defund the EPA and NOAA just for starters, no controls on gas and oil emissions, we are in deep s***. I had hopes that my grands and great grands would have a clean place to grow up. now, who knows.

I hope to NOT leave my children a costly mess

It threatens our food supply by potentially wreaking havoc with farming and home vegetable gardens. It may also cause water shortages. Thirdly, it will have negative impacts on native ecosystems. Food, water, and healthy ecosystems: all necessities, not luxuries.

Global climate change has a profound impact on biologic diversity and future generations.

I think what bothers me the most is to see how ignorant some people are about the whole thing. But climate change will be a game changer and I’d rather we do everything we can to soften or slow the blow.

Because it represents the end of all life as we know it.

Human impact on our earth is becoming profound enough that our way of life is bound to change dramatically in
the near future. I foresee water and food shortages and the comfort of living in some places will change. It can effect every part of Oregon's natural beauty.

Because of the potentially catastrophic and still not predictable global consequences that are already beginning to be felt around the world. Consequences that have serious implications for the health, quality of life, and even survival of all of the species with whom we share the Earth.

The results will impact everything, our wildlife, our food production, folks being displaced from their home connections, having to move to find food.

It's evidence of humans having not only a local impact on the environment, but creating global, systemic change. It impacts all other environmental issues: wildlife habitat, water supply, human health, etc.

If we don't have a planet, we're toast.

Because it effects our entire planet.

While I think the damage is already done, I also feel we have some choice, and responsibility, to not do more damage. I see it as a symptom of a lot of bad cultural choices, and an opportunity to shape our culture into something more resilient and mindful.

BEcause more rapid changes to the ecosystem wreak havoc on our world and ability to survive (and that of many others).

It is inappropriate for humans to so drastically change nature's balance.

Species changes, for one thing. Fewer adorable Pocket Gophers, for instance, more Pine Beetles.

Climate change is indisputably happening and will be the greatest public health disaster of this generation. It's costs will be manifold - human life, quality of life, and economic. Under a conservative estimate, by 2100 the city where I was born, Miami, will be underwater along with half of Florida. Disease vectors will spread across a much larger swath of the world, enabling transmissions of horrible diseases that already affect millions, such as mosquito-borne malaria. Refugees are already being forced from their homes in areas such as Bangladesh and the Maldives due to rising waters. I care because now is the time to act, while its still relatively easy - before the ice caps melt and we lose their albedo effect, before the Russian tundra permafrost melts and releases unquenchable methane deposits, with an emissions payload four times heavier than carbon dioxide. And I care because I’m still relatively young, and will have to live with this crap - unlike most of the disingenuous old fossil fuel hucksters who manufacture the "controversy" of climate change, as well as their constituents who readily accept lies so they don't have to face the truth. Sacrifices might actually be necessary. Also, I don't believe in the rapture, so there's that.

because i have a child...

It affects the flora and fauna of our planet. It takes a long time for them to adapt but climate change is happening too quickly so they can't adapt quick enough.

I think it is important to allow the Earth to go through its natural cycles as much as possible. As we create big environmental changes, which affect the climate dramatically, there are far-reaching effects, such as flooding, more extreme weather fluctuations, and receding glaciers. All these things affect the flora and fauna in Oregon.. I like our lush, rich ecosystems, and want to allow those to continue.

we are on track to ruin a perfectly good planet

I have a 10 year old daughter

I have a lot of knowledge and concern about ecological issues. I’ve been following the issue -- anthropogenic climate change -- in the mainstream scientific literature (SCIENCE, NATURE) for ~ 20 years or more.

The man made contributions need to be addressed as reducing emissions, etc lead to a healthier environment so can't hurt. And, if it helps curtail the effects on warming all the better. Too much dependance on petroleum and petroleum products is not good.

I see it as hugely threatening to all forms of life on earth, starting with frogs.

There is a very specific range of conditions that allow life to exist on this planet, and if we cause those conditions to change then all life will be affected. I feel it's my responsibility (all of ours actually) to ensure that my actions don't accelerate those changes and hopefully help maintain them.

It's our planet and the impacts of cc are causing damage to ecosystems, society's cultures and species. Actually I've been traveling recently to US coastal areas, small island nations, flooded watersheds, and in the mountains, and the effects of cc can be seen everywhere. Here in the states, I think most americans feel rather arrogant and/or immune, that cc is something we can overcome with little change in our lifestyles, or we can buy ourselves
around it by moving to higher ground and letting the less fortunate bear the brunt. The deniers are purposely ignoring the facts, corporations fear losing profits, and leadership has been weak. Also, I’m an environmental toxicologist, and recently I see climate change as a multiplier, a stress that further worsens other existing conditions, such as sanitation challenges, food security, basic public health and access to potable water.

I am a Registered Nurse and a Social Worker, and am deeply disturbed about the public health and social justice issues that result from climate change. And I can’t believe civilization is just allowing this to occur, ensuring devastation to marginalized people in the present, and to all in future generations.

It’s the biggest problem facing all of humanity. We cannot accurately predict the changes that will occur. Undoubtedly, however, everyone will experience its effects. We are the cause and, therefore, must be the solution.

I care about climate change because of the potential damage that we are inflicting on our environment and that of future generations.

The negative effects of climate change can be prevented. I am concerned because not a lot is being done to prevent continued global warming.

My job is in carbon footprinting and I have been interested in it for years and years.

I am an environmental scientist by trade. I work with stormwater at both the municipal and commercial levels.

Because I’m convinced that it has the potential to cause great long-term harm to many people and the environment in many parts of the world. I see the direct effects of climate change on the Oregon coast, where I’m working with a coastal community to develop strategies for adapting to rising sea level and increasing coastal erosion.

I have followed the science and regularly attend presentations on climate change. I believe there is a hockey stick pattern in global temperatures which will greatly affect Oregon’s forests and future. I have been project manager on three OWEB watershed assessments in Jackson County and am convinced the City of Ashland is the most vulnerable city in Oregon as climate change accentuates peak stream flow. There are 23 streams of which 20 are piped under Ashland in aging culverts. These already plug with decomposed granite, popping off manhole covers in storms. Clearly existing pipes are too small to handle present storm runoff.

I know it is happening, but I’m not sure of the exact causes. I won’t be around to see the worst of this, but my children, grand children, and great grand children will be. I believe that their quality of life is going to be greatly impacted by climate change. I feel very guilty that I didn’t do more over the years related to climate change activism.

Ultimately, these extreme changes will affect the food chain.....

It is such a long term problem with fixes implemented now which will not show benefits for years. I have kids who will really feel the brunt of previous generations’ greed.

it’s our future

Our survival is at risk as well as that of other living species.

I am a native Oregonian and very proud of the state.

If we don’t reverse the trend we are likely to face severe water shortages from shrinking glaciers (worldwide), and consequent famines everywhere. All species, including humans are very much at risk. I’m also very upset about acidification of the oceans. Loss of species, loss of food sources, loss of diversity.

I care because most people around the country/world don’t seem to at all. Also because my mother got us to start thinking about it (in rural eastern Washington) back in the mid ’80s. I want great grandchildren of mine to experience the same forests and coastlines that I have!

it seems that human activity is negatively affecting the environment, and has the potential to annihilate all life on earth.

It effects the food supply. It effects many species in different ways.

because I live and breathe here. The increasing effects of global warming will escalate weather anomalies creating more extremes that affect my life.

because it affects all of us. It not only affects our recreational choices, it affects our food production.

I have a disability and have difficulty with the weather as it is. If the weather is going to become more extreme, that means more money going to weather related disasters, less on medical care.

I care about how we got here, what we can do to turn around the problem, and what the future will hold for our Children & Grandchildren and for our fair planet.
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This is the only world we have. Change can appear slow, then quick and cataclysmic. The earth will survive, we, on the other hand.....
our future hangs in the balance
For future generations not to suffer.
To save the planet.
It has the power to end human life on Earth - and probably make us really miserable until then. I think human societies (at least many, if not all) will collapse, we'll partially revert to an older lifestyle, and may still die out. If humans die out, other species will fill the gap, as they did in natural climate changes before there were humans. But we'll probably take a lot of innocent species with us.
We, as humans, do not have the right to mess with the health of our planet.
Loss of species, dramatic disruption in will cause world wide - poorer countries disproportionately affected. Could threaten human existence if not addressed
Because I don't want future generations to have to struggle to live on a planet with inclimate weather.
I believe that Climate Change is absolutely imminent and that it is already increasing the direct suffering of millions of the planet's poorest inhabitants. I expect this suffering to increase exponentially in the next decades. At the same time, with Peak Oil and global economic meltdown, there will be fewer "resources" from wealthy, safe populations to help those who need it, whether in New Orleans or Pakistan. And honestly, whether equals food whether we're rich or poor. Drought kills plants and animals. Floods kill plants and animals. We need to come together in the human family about 30 years ago already!!!
It is, and will affect how we live. The places we love and enjoy.
If the trend doesn't stop whole ecosystems will be damaged/changed such that the natural flora & fauna will no longer be able to survive, or will have to move to a more suitable climate if that's possible.
Because it plays a major role in balancing the ecosystem
As a mountaineer, climate change causes glaciers to recede, which in turn will eventually keep some rivers from flowing through the summer, as well as changing the experience and safety of glacial travel. I also hate seeing the impact on the polar bears and a myriad of other creatures.
The climate stability we all take for granted is in jeopardy from global climate change brought about by human activity.
Because our human activity and overpopulation are making the planet less livable for humans; we've already exeeded earth's carrying capacity and the result -- we're already seeing it -- will be widespread devastation and misery for human beings and the destruction of a beautiful ecosystem.
There will be negative effects on the quality of life for life on the planet. People in the 3rd world are set to suffer the most.

$n = 248$

Carbon is released from several sources (see graphic to the right).

These sources are associated with activities that have benefits to humanity (food, shelter, heat, jobs...), making the reduction of carbon emissions a difficult task.

What do you think Oregon should focus on to limit the amount of carbon that is released?

(Please be sure to select all that apply)

Go to the root cause, too, and update the economy for the 21st century. Shift taxe
Support local organic agriculture industry - OR supplies 50% of it produce and food products by 2050.
None of the above, people will do these things themselves.
Everyone needs to do their part.
mass transit, urban planning, and consumption as entertainment
focus on people's behavior
"All of the above", but with a focus on Energy Supply and Transport.

Quit selling coal to China

For God's sake if we are serious about importation of fuel, potential repetitions of the Exxon-Valdez and BP's Gulf of Mexico Blow-out and cost of gasoline, we should have a state and federal laws that enforce a speed limit of a maximum of 55 mph. That would save about 20% of the fuel consumed per trip. Car pooling could be encouraged. We can handle things through personal responsibility. We are too dependent on engineering solutions to get out of a fix, when personal discipline can make the biggest difference.

shrink the human population significantly

education of all concerned

We need a carbon tax and incentives for businesses who meet or exceed best practices benchmarks

population

This is a world chart. What would one just for the Northwest show?

Political will. And it should be gained as a program for Natural Disaster Emergency Preparedness. Carbon emission limitations are good for goals but are feeble at best and build opposition at worst.

It will take the creativity, innovation, of us all to accomplish what is needed.

Cars should be focused on; our houses also.

Water use

Energy efficiency across the board would save Oregonians more energy and reduce the overall demand - it's always been the white elephant & is now finally getting more recognition. Electrical distribution lines are also a huge source of energy losses, we need to upgrade this antiquated system.

Citizens must also gain an understanding of this issue and conserve in their own activities and consumer practices and political action.

Conservation and Sustainability mandates

This graph makes it hard to see real problem. Needs updating to reflect production of goods and food. Much easier for individuals to understand-this makes it look as if the problem is "out there" not in personal lifestyle.

Basically, all of the above.

innovation in mitigation/restoration methods

remove burnt timber and let it be milled and replant new trees

mining/raw materials manufacturing

I am especially concerned about the slash burning. The wood could be composted or used for fuel.

individual action

loaded question, not as black and white as it appears

There should be zero tolerance in regards to carbon emissions.

Daily lives of every citizen. Period.

better communicating the science

human population increase

cross sector opportunities: e.g. utilize forest slash to produce biochar for agricultural soils to both reduce reliance on petroleum-derived fertilizers and sequester carbon

The question is too vague and can not be answered by theselection

It needs to happen with everything we do! I think encouraging local food etc. production would be a huge help...

Human eating and its impacts; Human activities; packaging;
I feel the built environment has more ability to change than agriculture, forestry and the natural environment. 

energy efficiency and reduced consumption

Populations - to many people - What Ever happened to Zero Population Growth from years gone by????

food localization

Feed-in tariffs to deploy renewable energy

**Which agricultural issues do you think should be focused on in Oregon?**

*Other responses filled in*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organic farming and eliminating fossil fuel use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift to non petroleum based fertilizer, focus on Organic methods including livestock rotation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon emissions from cattle in meat &amp; dairy industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce and consume fewer animal products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate use of non-organic fertilizers; get soil nutrients from animal waste on small scale pasture-based agriculture, no more monocrop agribiz..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end field burning and switch to no-till practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n = 6**

**Which waste management issues should be focused on in Oregon?**

*Other responses filled in*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing consumption in the first place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creating products that are compostible and will decompose more naturally and quickly, and product packaging that is more sustainable and natural, more knowlege and possibility of recycling, coming up with a way to recycle in a less carbon emitting manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce, reuse, recycle!!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n = 3**

**Which industrial issues should be focused on?**

*Other responses filled in*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is &quot;product labeling&quot; an industrial issue?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toxic emissions; GHG emissions; true cost of waste disposal (including packaging - full life cycle); true cost of production - full life cycle; sustainable sourcing of materials and labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of chemicals in products and more testing of the long-lasting affects that products have on humans and the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n = 3**

**What other issues do you think Oregon should focus on?**

*Other responses filled in*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The carbon effects from the several recent volcanic erruptions. How their carbon emmissions effect global cooling!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of us need to participate in the solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy efficiency in buildings and transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many people in the world and too many in Oregon. About 300 million worldwide is about right, which would mean an Oregon population of around 200 thousand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and personal energy use - because by making average Oregonians more aware of their own impact on carbon emissions in their daily activities, it will educate them directly and encourage them to push harder for action in all the <em>other</em> areas that are, in terms of numbers, more significant. Political action and difficult decisions will be easier when the general public is more educated and invested - whereas focusing on areas with actual larger emissions (such as industry and forestry) might have greater impact, but will be harder if the public is ignorant or ambivalent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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retrofitting existing buildings
There must be a holistic approach if we are to succeed, Going at the problem piece meal is ridiculous.
We should focus on educating the public on a common sense approach to conservation, not on legislative and
bureaucratic solutions that use tax dollars and create larger intrusive government regulatory agencies
Tax carbon emissions and you get all of them.

\[ n = 9 \]

Which forestry issues do you think should be focused on in Oregon?  
(Other responses filled in)
Leave all mature old growth forests alone and allow younger forests to develop into old
growth.
allow the burnt timber to be harvested
Instead of burning piles of wood in the forests from trees that have been culled, give it to the
poor to use for heating.

\[ n = 3 \]

Which energy or utility issues should be focused on in Oregon?  
(Other responses filled in)
capture energy released during production
more solar & wind power generators
this is the first step although should be coupled with a few of the others
carbon tax on all sources at 'wellhead'
provide incentives for reducing energy use
The ones with the greatest impact and ones where the greatest results can be obtained.
look for other solutions, wind, solar, ocean wave power
Anything with significant results
or consider a cap-and-trade mechanism
Although it it is not a carbon-based energy source, Oregon should remain non-nuclear.
alternative energy R&D investments
Supplement regional power distribution with clean local production
Bring back Nuclear Power
Not just conserve, accept the end of economic growth due to resource limits worldwide.
research increasing efficiency of e.g. solar energies
evertheless the energy grid
eliminate coal-based generation

\[ n = 17 \]

Which one "other" utility issue would you focus on?
I don't know which would be the best to select -- those with the greatest impact to bring about
positive results.

\[ n = 1 \]

Which transportation issues should be focused on in Oregon?  
(Other responses filled in)
promote cycling
Encourage biking and walking, the ultimate in low-/no-carbon footprint transportation.
Cycling infrastructure!
Drive at 55 mph
All the above, actually, but especially the ones I’ve marked
alternative fuels like biodiesel (not corn based ethanol)
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Re-structuring cities to have walkable centers, bicycle use, and rapid transit.
Adequate bicycle facilities in all cities
Address land use planning laws.
Bring back the trains that used to criss cross Oregon!! Develop better public transportation in every way....

\[ n = 10 \]

**Which one "other" utility issue would you focus on?**

population - too many people, finite resources

\[ n = 1 \]

**Why do you think we should produce more of our energy domestically?**

We need more domestic nuclear power plants to generate electricity; more domestic gas production for heating; more domestic oil production for transportation.

Drill for oil and gas, and use more hydro

Reduction of energy consumption. No wars needed to ensure domestic needs. Makes geographic sense. Keeps American Dollars in America.

Because we're spending our money overseas to keep ourselves afloat. We need to drill for oil here. We shouldn't have to buy oil from Brazil or Saudi Arabia. PetroBraus is doing very well thanks to our President who says he's so concerned ab out the environment. He gave a permit for Brazil to drill off our coasts but not our own oil companies. Pathetic. Also, while the EPA is causing so many coal companies to shut down do to too many regulations, our government is shipping our coal over to China to be used in one of their many new coal factories. If I'm correct, China is building a new coal factory every week for energy use and using our coal to do it.

Because energy resources are openly manipulated by organizations such as OPEC, it seems a no-brainer that it would be better to have reliable competition to keep them from having undue leverage over world energy supply. The only way to guarantee reliability is for the industry to be domestic.

We have an abundance of resources here at home but no one wants to disrupt this or that. Why are we paying other countries to give us what we can give ourselves?

Because we have natural resources available.

Independence and freedom go hand in hand. Our dependance on other nations allows a political and economic dynamic that will inherently effect our freedom that we value so highly. Development of our own resources is just good business and it keeps the wealth at home.

Because it is there. Off-shore drilling, oil in the Dakotas, dam more rivers, and use more coal.

It is less costly and will provide thousands of new jobs for our citizens.

I am not sure if this just means tapping our own oil fields. I am not endorsing that without more thought and information. But if we can develop our own industries in solar and wind, and other alternative sources, that makes sense to me: US jobs, US quality controls, less reliance on foreign countries and less transportation. Plus, if our family and friends are involved in production, we might be more apt to endorse and use alternative sources of power. I would include infrastructure, such as public transportation and railroads that would allow us to limit our oil use as a part of producing more energy domestically - using mass transit is just energy in another form.

We have many reserves of energy, all this "green energy" is another government scheme to re-distribute wealth. We should let the market control energy demands and get the gov. subsidies out of the picture!

Because it's there and ours to 'use'. If we're concerned about the 'global' environment, why should we encourage OTHER countries to drill for oil and NOT do it here! The pipe line in Alaska has been GOOD for our economy and has not harmed anything. (In fact, there are MORE elk there now than before!) I don't believe we should 'SAVE' a snail-darter at the expense of humans. We need MORE drilling in our own country!

1--We have the resources. 2--We need the jobs.

Energy independence is a good thing

God has blessed us with ABUNDANT resources; we are foolish and ungrateful to not use the gifts we've been given; not to mention we're shooting ourselves in the foot by bowing to foreign dictators instead of taking care
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of ourselves.
Because we have no reason to import it from other countries.
Hmm. Assuming that you're an employee of the state, didja ever wonder where your paycheck came from? It comes from the private sector folks who build, create and invest in businesses that with work and effort, earn a profit. Imagine, energy produced domestically. Like the seep off the Columbia River. Imagine oil production here, with jobs here, resources here, revenues here, profits here. Or, imagine sending more dollars to foreign producers, to pay their employees, creating revenues there, profits there. Should I have to answer a question as addle-pated as this? Since you are a government employee, I guess it is unavoidable.
We have bountiful supplies of natural gas, oil, and other resources. Our reliance upon foreign sources is wasteful and unnecessary.
To control financial costs and maximize leverage with foreign nations.
Create jobs here
control
We need to be more independant from other countries that can use energy to manipulate our economy depending on what they want from us. I also think we need manufacturing jobs here not somewhere else to employ people. I think we should also be focusing on using less. There is so much talk about how we can live the same and use the less. That isn't true for 90% plus homes in Oregon. We need to be talking about using less.
Transferring hundreds of billions of dollars every year to other countries to supply our energy needs is unhealthy for America. We should be using our own energy resources and keeping the money and jobs at home.
It is always a good idea to be self suffecient
Because locally-produced energy creates local jobs, and it better insures our own national security.
keep $ here lessen support of unpleasant regimes elsewhere create jobs
Cost efficiency and independent of foreign oil.
We need to use energy wisely and productively. We should develope new American sources but only where practical and economically feasible. First and foremost, we should use up all the Arab oil first---no matter the cost! Then we can sell them water for the price of the last barrel of oil!
Terrorists...That's an easy one
More drilling for oil along with all viable alternate energy sources should be explored and opened up in our country. When we're dependent upon other countries for our energy, that makes us weaker and more susceptible.
In an effort to minimize our reliance of foreign energy sources.
We can take advantage of regional resources and can implement more conservation/efficiency actions at a more local level
To keep jobs here. We need to tap into oil that is in our country and also use new safe nuclear power. Also regulations should not be limiting our use of dams for clean renewable energy.
Why do we keep sending jobs and our solutions/problems within overseas? Why should we not handle it domestically?
Anytime you have to depend on someone else's goodwill you're leaving yourself open to their whims, good or bad. Self-reliance is always the best idea. Suppose there was no gasoline, how would people get to work where there is no transit (and there isn't any in some locations). Are you ready to ride a horse as they did a century ago? Hybred cars may work in town, but they won't deliver groceries to the market, or cattle to the feedlot. Right now the farmers are paying premium prices to run their tractors to put food on the table (yours and mine) and how does it get from the field to the market...BY TRUCK which takes more fuel.
More jobs for those of us who live here, IF the carbon problem is real then shipping oil from other parts of the world make no logical sense at all, as this is adding to the problem
I like the idea of being self-reliant.
So that it will be cheaper. We may then also be less inclined to go to war in other parts of the world.
utilize our own resourses so we aren't so dependent on other countrys
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Nuclear, hydro, coal. But that is just my opinion, the market should make the final determination. We must stop subsidizing flaky non-viable forms of energy that don't pencil and which raise the rates on conventional utilities.

More jobs for americans

national security

we have ample amounts of energy but not using it we need to allow more drilling in the us.

We need to eliminate our dependance on foreign oil and replace our foreign oil with our own domestic oil. Geo thermal energy should be utilized.

To be more independent, not rely on countries that have no use for us.

We are going broke importing. In a dangerous world, it is a matter of national security. We need the jobs.

So we are more secure and more in control of our lives.

1) Each citizen should strive to be self sufficient and so should Oregon and the US. 2) If we use our own energy resources that leaves more available from other parts of the world to those areas that don't have their own energy sources. 3) Producing our own energy would create US jobs. 4) We could limit interference in other parts of the world due to our so-called US interests.

The tech is there. The oil is there. Oil is abiotic and continue to be reproduced versus only fossil fuel based. However greater controls and restrictions that force clean energy tech need be implemented. Greater anti-monopoly efforts need be put in place against Opec and the Big Oil majors for corrupt "Energy Monopoly" practices. Local energy is smart. Cheap energy is wise. Clean tech is the future. Free energy is possible if infrastructures can be implemented from the abusers. Abusers are both the uneducated and the Oil Barrons of today ... but not the common person driving and polluting.

Creation of Jobs, Less foreign dependance and it makes sense in logistics and economic growth.

The USA has plenty of untapped oil and gas supplies that help us if only the Greenies would let us drill for it.

we can produce oil cheaper than buying from arabs

Jobs

Simply because it's available to us and much less expensive than importing. These God given resources should be utilized!

a matter of common sense, economics, and long term survival. We are being raped by OPEC, we have vast reserves of many different energy-producing sources and it is unconscionable that we are not developing all of them. It has been proven without any doubt that the many alternative energy sources will NOT provide sufficient energy to replace natural fuel sources. Again, it is a liberal scam to drive prices of fuel UP in order to make people approve of absurd schemes for alternative sources.

too many reasons to mention here, but we have the resources and technology to produce ALL of our own energy. Many of these resources cannot be taken advantage of because regulations (much like the ones you are trying to force upon the citizens) are impeding Americans from capitalizing on them.

Here in Oregon it should be hydroelectric overwhelmingly!

How about letting the private market prevail, methane powered generators. Dams. Hydrogen generation is a practical alternative. In ten years most of the wind machines now installed will be obsolete and non-functioning. Their efficiency is low. Business tax credits have made them happen now.

Domestic sources improve our economy

Use our hydro, natural gas, oil, coal. We have tons of it.

Because we have an abundance of it here. Why enrich foreign Nations, some of those being intent on our demise?

Because we have more coal and shale oil then any other country. We could be immediately energy self sufficient if we utilized these resources. hence reducing our balance of payments deficit.

If we were more energy independent and produced more of our own oil and natural gas the speculators would not be able to cause the sharp rise in prices as is currently possible. We need to develope new and alternate energy as we can but to cut off existing sources such as oil and coal as a means to stimulate a rush to new technology is hurting our economy and only pushes to promote panic driven alternatives that may not be well conceived.

1) Balance of trade is important 2) Standard of living and energy use are closely coupled. 3) We have a lot of
coal, natural gas, uranium, and thorium, the latter may have major benefits over uranium reactors. So we do not rely so much on foreign oil, and this can be done if we open up our vast resources of oil, coal and gas, plus build more nuclear power plants, and use hydro power to its fullest. Wind power while warm and fuzzy for some people is unacceptable as a major power source unless highly subsidized by me, and my fellow taxpayers. Most of these giant wind sources would not exist if the politicians didn’t transfer peoples wealth to wind power providers. It is not cost effective.

Decreased DEPENDENCE translates directly to increased INDEPENDENCE. Without independence we are in for a rough ride

American has the highest standards of energy production and pollution standards. Sending our coal to China for them to produce energy is just inept relative to the bigger picture for instance. Sending our drilling rigs to Brazil is even worse! Why would anyone think for one minute they have better controls or standards.

National security

Why pay for foreign oil and exaggerated prices?? Gas costing $4.00/ gallon with no stopping or lowering in sight. "o" stated we will be Brazil's best customer for oil purchases...WTF!!! We have trillions of gallons in ANWAR, off shore, South Dakota... more lies from this administration and the alarmists!!!

The United States of America has more than adequate supplies of both biotic and abiotic oil, one being the "fossil fuel" everyone is so concerned about, and the other that is endless, and continually being made with the two most prevalent compounds in our Earth’s Crust, Calcium Carbonate, and Iron Oxide, which under extreme pressure and temperature, such as the Earth’s Plates, sliding uder each other, oil is produced, and the Earth’s rotation, spins it outward to the surface. Centifical force. Endless, and the difference is the deep oil contains 'Diamoniods', not found in Fossil oil. Next, we have abundance of soft coal. This is easily made into charcoal. The English have been doing it for over a century. No more "Peculiar Fog" there! Oregon, prior to WW11, and Hydro electric dams, supplied all the coal for heat and electricity from Seattle through San Fransisco, and that was just from Coos and Curry Counties. We have our own Natural Gas, which is also NOT a fossil fuel, or perhaps you can explain why the moon Titan going around Saturn, has volcanos of it spewing forever? When produced and refined domestically, not only are we not held to the myth of "Limited Supply", and OPEC, our own cost of citizen purchase will be minimal, jobs will open for production, refining, and shipping, and we will have surpluses to sell world wide. This will also allow the U.S. of A. to again mine and refine its own ore, manufacture its own steel, and bring back to our soil, American jobs for American Workers. Need I explain more? I will if need be.

If I can make something or do something myself, why would I want to buy it? I hate being in bondage to anything or anyone. The US has the ability to be completely autonomous but we began trading with other countries to help bolster their economies and for other nefarious reasons. Now look, what do we have to show for it? These other countries despise us and deceitfully use us. We have spent a lot of time, effort and money on the rest of the world and I for one, think it's time to stop. We should turn the lights back on in our factories and get back to work taking care of ourselves.

It’s vital for national security. Keep our treasure away from our enemies. It's good for the economy. Keep our treasure at home to increase our standard of living. Might even create some jobs. It's logistically sensible. It's not easy to move electricity across oceans.

It takes control over the United States away from foreign governments. It would create jobs and prosperity for more citizens of the United States. The United States should not be dependent upon any other country for critical resources.

Why not!

We have some of the largest oil, gas, and coal reserves in the world, but have chosen to use very little of them. Our energy reserves are sufficient to sustain our needs for centuries without using foreign supplies.

We have it and lets drill to get it.

Stop removing dams, drill for oil and natural gas, build nuclear plants.

We should explore all the natural resources we have, OIL and Coal along with Hydro and nuc. power. Wind and Solar are too unreliable and not fully vetted.

middle eastern countries are hostile toward us

So we quit giving money to people that want us dead and so we can return to being a prosperous nation.

so economic adversaries can't arbitrarily raise the price

energy security
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We already do... What do you consider the hydroelectric plants on the Columbia river?
Economic and political stability.
I believe that this is a stupid question but it is obvious that having our energy produced in the US is much better than supporting those countries that are doing everything they can to destroy us.
Oil in the Bakkan Reservoirs, Alaska’s north slope, offshore California, Oregon, Texas Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North and South Carolina. Natural Gas from the vast reservoir that exists in the Rocky Mountains and elsewhere. Coal deposits that exist in several places in the West including the coal that was locked up by Bill Clinton swinging a deal with the Indonesians. Water in the Pacific Northwest. Stop cluttering the environment with subsidized windmills. Stop destroy food with subsidized corn. Stop manufacturing Solar cells. It takes more energy to make a silicon wafer than the the photocell generates in power over its lifetime.
Keep it local. How can we cry about the economy when just about everything on the market says "Made in China" Of course we can cry about the housing market being sour which has nothing to do with out of the country things. Why should we think any other than keeping our energy products local DUH?
It helps our economy and makes us more secure.
We have so much natural energy at are back door. Hydro power, coal, etc. Wind is a joke as it has to be subsidized to make it viable. If it can stand on it’s own without the tax payers having to pay for it get rid of them.
less dependant on foreign governments
We have control of energy that we produce. We cannot control the availability of foreign energy sources therefore supply and prices are out of our control. As far as environmental impacts and pollution, foreign sources are much more likely to pollute than our own companies that have more safety procedures and practices.
Drill for domestic oil and natural gas. Increase hydroelectric projects. Get rid of ALL energy subsidies, including ethanol, wind and solar.
Because I am sick and tired of being held hostage by Arab nations, particularly at the pump. We have great reserves here. We need to tap them.
We need to become less dependent on countries and people that envy and hate us. We also need to quit shipping jobs overseas because some environmental Nazis won’t let us drill or harvest our own resources.
Because it is available and we should not be dependent upon foreign sources.
So we will stop getting screwed every time we need to go to the fuel pumps!!!
The USA has huge fossil fuel reserves, we should start drilling in the continental US, off shore, in ANWR and the Gulf. Drill Here, Drill Now Pay Less. We currently produce and refine 2/3 rds of the number of barrels of product that we did in the 70s and 80s because of environmental restraints. If we started to drill again we would reduce our dependance on Canada, Mexico, South America, Africa and the middle East. The price of a gallon of gasoline has increased 120% since Obama was anointed in January 2009, we have lost high paying jobs and the unemployment rate has has increased 23%. Domestic drilling would lower the cost of gasoline and increase high paying jobs
Narrows the balance of trade deficit and long term makes use less dependent on foreign manipulation of energy prices.
oil
Economy
The country is broke. to think that we cane save the earth when the rest of the world is'n't doing anything is complete stupidity. more domestically produced energy would help the US security and economy.
Keep our people working. Screw the others
Better to be dependent on ourselves, we create jobs. Less worry on other countries controlling us.
national security
Oregon has an abundance of natural resources that can be tapped for energy if the environmentalist would stop their ridiculous lawsuits. Hydro Power should be included in the equation for green energy. If Hydro Power was included Oregon more than meets the requirements which have been set by regulatory agencies.
More economically stable and reliable supply source and removes our reliance on foreign supplies. Creates jobs and provides better control of unacceptable human and environmental impacts.
Coal.

We need to be our own masters of energy. Foreign influence and greed has created the high price of fuel. Besides all that, domestic energy is available here at home. It’s the rules and regulations that prohibit U.S. investors from finding and developing oil and gas sources here at home.....and to keep the oil barrons floating the river of cash to those who write those regulations. It’s simple deduction!

Because of dependence on unfriendly foreign sources. We have the resources - the government doesn’t have the will. They want to control energy prices for revenue purposes.

For all the usual reasons: control, jobs, cost.

Because we have it available; we have a surfeit of oil and gas -- we just need refractory capability. And we need to get rid of ethanol. How nice we have been able to so negatively affect the world’s food supply AND at the same time not really affect the gas use. My car lost 10 to 15 % of the mpg that it used to get when we did not have to use gas with ethanol.

We currently purchase $40 billion worth of oil from abroad for our 300 million cars. Yet the Obama admin blocks additional drilling in the gulf and in ANWR. That $40 billion could produce10 million jobs domestically at $40,000 per year indefinitely. Others say that we need more solar and wind power yet none of those 300 million cars are electric. And Americans don’t want electric just yet. Less than 60 Nissan Leafs were sold in America in the last month.

Not subject to outside interference

We cannot allow ourselves to become dependent on foreign nations to 'solve' the problems we have created. I do not understand why our government officials don’t want us to drill in Anwar, or off shore. There are risks with everything.

The U.S. has more than an ample supply of energy for hundreds of years within our own Nation. This would eliminate us being held hostage by anti-U.S. Nations in the Middle East. This would lower the price of energy and produce millions of jobs of our Nation and rebuild a strong(non-dependent Nation). WE need all kinds of energy-mostly oil, and gas, hydro-power and clean coal which are abundant by drilling and exploring NOW.

Wind power and solar power is not economically now or in the near future. We have the expertise to make this Nation what is once was before Government Regulations; and environmental activists(mostly uneducated) are anti-capitalism, and want to replace our way of life with Socialism(which throughout history has failed over and over). Let’s get real-now we are propping up dictatorships all over the world. Private enterprise is awesome if you just get Gov’t off our backs and out of our pocketbooks-which does nothing more than bankrupt the U.S. Please don't give in the crazy Al Gore mentality.

Because it is available!!!!!!! When Obama limits drilling for oil in our country and environmentalists prevent us from obtaining oil from the vast oil shale and environmentalists want to force us to spend more money for solar energy and winmills and tear out our hydroelectic dams, I see a trend to force us to do these things THAT ARE NOT NECESSARY. Sounds more like a socialist/communist idea doesn’t it? What we need most is a new president and to stop the brainwashing that is going on in our schools

It is less expensive and will create local jobs.

Because we need it and do not need to be slaves to our enemies.

To reduce costs and sustain our own economy, while securing our own access to energy.

Drill for OIL and use more COAL! Wind energy is USELESS SOLAR is NOT the answer HYDROELECTRIC is the best souse of Green Energy

Job creation, tax revenue increases. When we produce power with subsidized tax money when the return on investment is 20 years it helps no one. Lets learn to help ourselves and stop the Solar and wind nonsense. There is no money left to pour down the sewer. Spending $750,000 to install electric stations on I5 is a prime example. These cars burn coal.

America has plenty of untapped energy sources being blocked by power mad Commie-liberal control freaks.

Open up oil exploration in the US. Allow the free market to support energy sources and get the gov’t subsidies of wind and solar. Let these business stand on their own and allow the need for innovation that will make this a viable source of energy. Supporting these sources the way government does is not supporting improvements. It is allowing stagnation.

We need to end our dependence on foreign oil, which doesn’t just run automobiles. There are many uses of petroleum in our daily lives which are necessary for our way of life. We have natural gas and oil reserves at out disposal, but the Federal government is keeping a lid on exploration and refining, I believe for reasons
that have nothing to do with oil, but with social engineering.
Everything that the market justifies: mining, oil, gas, hydro and nuclear. Wind an solar are worth trying too providing no government mandates or subsidies are involved. Now is the time to eliminate regulations and taxes which fetter, impede the activities of the private (the productive) sector.
Because we have abundant energy resources in America, if the environmental activists would allow us to drill more oil wells, tap our shale deposits and stop hindering our hydroelectric projects with law suits we could be self sufficient.
Because we HAVE IT ALREADY.
Oil drilling should be renewed. Cut government interference.
Make us less dependent on unfriendly nations; reduce our indebtedness; put us in control of our own destiny; improve our overall economy; help keep us our of global conflicts
Your kidding? How many billions are wasted going to people who do not like us! We have many reserves of current trechnology that should be utilized as we start actually formulating a plan to move away from current technology. It should not happen with the government intervening. If the government wants to hlp, let them setup a project like the Manhatten Project and find an energy source that is clean and meets our future needs! This country has no plans and is doomed to await a crisis to resolve the problems!
We have rivers which allow us to make cheap electricity, We should never remove a dam for the sake of removal. Our country has enough oil and natrual gas along with coal to make cost effective power. This will allow us enough time to develop alternative engery sources which should not be subsidized. What we are doing today is completely wrong. By subsidizing alternative engery we driven the cost of fuel, electricity, food, clothing and most everything else out of sight. What have gained by this? Nothing! We must invest wisely and develop them to stand and perform on their own.
To become independent once again. Use our own resources; including coal, natural gas, and drill for more oil. Use more hydro (which is green to many except the environmentalist).
Controlling your own energy resources allows you more economic freedom and does not drag you into areas of the world that are politically unstable. The happiest days for Americans is when the oil sheikdoms return to their historic irrelevance.
we have all the resources here, why wouldn't we?
Support local economy. We have the resources.
Absolutely! We have numerous energy reserves that are not being tapped due to political pressures. We need to provide our own fossil fuel supplies and not rely so heavily on foreign countries.
Be free of foreign countries. create more jobs here
We do not have to be at the mercy of other countries. Also our own people get the jobs and WE regulate it and make sure safety and health standards are applied..
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36 What do you like about this road payment formula idea?
Oregon has a weight-mile tax on heavy vehicles. There should be a similar tax on all motor vehicles. There should also be a heavy tax on studded-tire use with a seasonal window sticker to show it's been paid, and a heavy fine if it hasn't.
all would pay for roads, bicycles could pay also
I would include how heavy their vehicle is as well. I think if you are using the system more, than it is fair to pay more. We do this with other things: bus tickets, parking meters, credits at school, $/#... Probably a system for some job related miles would have to be worked out for certain jobs. We all need nudges to change, and this seems logical. but I live close in with services, stores, bike lanes, a bus line close at hand. So I am influenced by that I am sure to some degree. I think when I was growing up In Detroit, our auto license was based somewhat on the weight of the vehicle and no one seemed to bat an eye. But, Detroit did not develop lighter cars though either, so there you are! It is not enough to have more efficient cars, etc, without using less energy, and this might make us stop and think a bit more before we turned the key.
Weight and miles probably determine wear. It's math. Don't concern yourself if you don't understand it.
People who use roads should pay for them - and yes, I believe that cyclists should be licensed, registered, and insured as part of the mix. I would not support any scheme that continues to divert fuel tax and other fees to bicycle lanes and streetcars, as is presently the case.
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Fuel economy should not be a factor in assessing a road use fee, only miles traveled should be a factor. incentive and behavior based
We become more conscious of the energy costs we as individuals incur (the real costs) for mobility It will give the most direct connection between use and cost. This relies on a similar principle that the Free Market uses to assign prices to things. I do not, however, agree that more funds need to be raised to pay for our roads.
whoever uses the roads pays
What formula? There hasn't been a formula proposed to me.
We need a monetary model that accounts for "truer" costs of our energy. Owners of cars that get very poor mileage should pay more of their costs to form financial incentives.
its probably a necessary evil ! My fear is that revenues would be diverted to 'Pork barrel' projects like they do with the lottery and water/sewer Bills.
The roads have to be funded in some manner
It would be more fair to all. Those who can afford to upgrade to a more fuel efficient form of transportation now pay the most in fuel taxes.
It matches the current tax policy - people who drive less with more efficient vehicles buy less fuel and already pay less tax. Caveat - trucks do more damage to road surfaces per gallon of fuel, so I have no problem with appropriate taxation for that.
It depends on how it is administered, tracked and collected. Some proposals that have been floated in the past and currently are pathetically ill conceived on many levels, but the basic idea is a relatively sound one.
Road taxes should be based on vehicle weight and miles driven, just like commercial trucks.
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37 What don't you like about this road payment formula idea?

Whether we drive or not does not lessen our dependence on roads to receive and transport goods. Businesses need them. Grocery stores, garden shops, hummer dealers, farmers, exporters, importers, and the rest of Oregon's economy would be hit with an across the board price increase for goods (whether that's food, building supplies or anything else).
Everyone who uses the roads, whether fuel efficient or not, should take part in maintaining them. The fuel efficient cars cause just as much erosion of pavement as any other vehicle in its size class.
If you want people to drive more fuel efficient cars, you should not try to make it more expensive for them.
Let's use an analogy. Say a family has a monthly food budget, that is designed to provide plenty of food for the home, along with a family restaurant trip twice a week... but they find after a few months that they're running out of funds halfway through the month. Upon checking receipts, they find that the children of the family are buying a couple hundred dollars worth of videos and video games with the food budget money. Now, is the correct solution to expand the food budget? Oregon has problems with their road funds... in Portland, millions upon millions are spent adding "improvements" to perfectly workable roads, such as wider planters, traffic calming, rainwater runoff pits, mini-traffic circles, and bicycle improvements, while roads that need resurfacing or widening are left to rot. Elsewhere in the state roadwork is done with substandard materials at inflated prices... in a long-standing corrupt system within ODOT that no one ever wants to talk about. Clean up the system, and get priorities back in line first, then look for more funds if necessary.
Because those of us who drive for work (need to get paid to pay these fees!), will be unfairly taxed. I think we need to look at everything as a whole. I have been told by someone who works for the City that the products being used to improve/maintain city streets are of a lower quality than what they used to use, for example. If we pay people to do a job every 2-3 years, yes it gets expensive. How about we use a better product and pay to have the work completed less frequently? It's costs more to pay people than it does for the product.
Creating a more complicated taxing system will only create more problems. The more adjustable you make it the more those who are in the know will adjust their burden down and let others carry it for them. I am not convinced that one system would be fairer than the other. Change for the sake of change is not a good enough reason. More efficient cars are also lighter and will inherently have less wear and tear on the roads. If you want people to buy and drive fuel efficient cars don't tax them for it. that is a sure way of lowering their marketability.
Gas tax revenue is adequate to support road maintainence if our political leaders would control unnecessary
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spending.
Again, the gov, has backed it's way into a box! Demanding more efficient cars and oops! Ah, how are we going to pay for all this stuff with falling revenues! Too much gov. intervention.
We pay for schools whether we have children or not. We pay for police and fire protection whether we ever use them or not. So, we should all pay for roads equally whether we drive or not! Anyway, it's trucks that bring our food and other items that ruin the roads more than our personal autos and we ALL benefit from that! So, the cost of road maintenance should be spread over all equally...
I don't trust the government formula. The gasoline tax, as is, accounts for miles driven and fuel efficiency. Hogwash!
First of all, it violates the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; secondly, this kind of thing is not a Constitutional role of government.
First of all this entire carbon issue is a non issue. It is totally phoney. I built a completely self sustaining home of my own design way back in 1976 in the Santa Cruz Mountains of California. I received PG&E's very first award for the design and efficiency of that structure. What we need to do is spend more time developing geothermal energy here in Oregon. This whole carbon issue is a load of crap. It's ignorant of fact.
It penalizes efficiency. Earmark a transportation tax on vehicles and bicycles based on weight of vehicle/bike with no exemptions.
We already pay for the roads
Tax cars with lower than 20 MPG
I think the "formula" that has been come up with penalizes high efficient cars and ignores all the money "we" have spent for bikes and it effectively punishes people for making a better choice. I think you need to be taxing the bikes in some way. License them. I have one I use one and it should be a source of revenue. If you are going to penalize a decision penalize cars that get less per gallon than some number by charging them more per year to register their cars. If the tax is made at the time someone buys a car and they are deciding between a prius and a hummer, then if they had to pay an extra 1000 in taxes to buy the hummer they might decide to buy the prius. And that is better in the long run
Just imagine all the new bureaucrats running around trying to determine how many miles each Oregonian has driven and how efficient their car is. Imagine all the taxes that will be required to support this. Imagine all the schemes that enterprising Oregonians will devise to avoid the new tax. What a waste of time and energy and money. The gas tax will of course still be in place so we are left with more people running around in make work jobs that dose nothing but frustrate our freedom and run up the already out of control state budget.
It is punitive to those who buy expensixe energy efficient cars. It would probably be too cumbersome to manage and therefor expensive. I believe Gov't has plenty of money but does not allocate it correctly and it is wasted by Gov't.
There are MUCH better ways to encourage responsible use of energy resources & our nation's infrastructure than fuel taxation or this horrible idea.
Should all go to highways and not rail and bicycle trails.
More social engineering. I am ok with a per/mile tax but who cares how efficient or not someone's vehicle is or isn't!
That's more taxation. Instead we should get rid of government waste. We're a nanny state and there are too many people with their hands out. Instead government should be reduced and thus free up more money for what the public REALLY needs.
It would penalize people for buying more efficient vehicles. Taxing efficiency. If you want less of something, tax it.
people with low income jobs that have to travel can't afford extra taxes. Why does the government seem to think tax increases are always the best solution? What about all the illegal immigrants who use our road systems, throw their trash everywhere, and bicyclists from outside their own districts who come into our neighborhoods and take over our roads/neighborhoods - how will they be charged and help in paying the local road costs/fees?????
TAX, TAX, TAX first you tax the new car, then you penalize them for buying it. Now what part of that makes sense to you. Why should I put out the extra money for a car that I'm going to get taxed on again and again
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and again. I have a car that's 15 years old and on the highway it gets 33 mpg; that's better than many of the new ones. I have two or three trips I make each year clear across the state. Now why should I buy a NEW car?
Because it feels like Big Brother looking over my shoulder, an invasion of my privace. I believe in small government and fewer regulations and restrictions. I don't need governnet to tell me how to conserve, I have been doing it for years even though the more I conserve, the higher the rates and the more hidden taxes appear on my statements. Government needs to realize that the jobs we, the public, are looking to obtain are private sector jobs, not government employee jobs. There are so many bureaus, boards, committees and administrations I don't think government knows how many there are, how useful they are or whether they should be "sunsetted". The road payment formula sounds like someone will be looking over my shoulder to see how many miles I have driven and then what is next, someone telling me I can't go there, or I'm not driving enough to help pay for the plan so an increase is necessary. Don't get me wrong, I do not hate government, I am just concerned that it is getting too big and is too intrusive into citizens lives.
Because you are now discriminating against the low and fixed income people, it will be another expense they can't afford, sorry your public transportation system sucks. Three people with mobility scooters can't get on the bus at the same time, limit is two. Max is not any better not enough room for mothers with stroller and people with mobility issues, so we take our vehicles. Lets put it this way, $5.00 buys a little over a gallon of gas, I can get six eggs and quart of milk, a loaf of day old bread and a pound of hamburger, ok you get the idea

I think that tracking miles violates people's privacy. I'd be happy to see gas taxes raised and based upon vehicle weight so that the vehicles doing the most damage to the roads are paying for it. It could be implemented simply with a scale at the gas pump and calculated automatically. It would encourage people to drive lighter vehicles and not keep unneeded things in their car which decreases mileage.

It tends to benefit those that can afford the better car and fuel to drive more miles

It is regressive and penalizes economic activity. We already have a formula that works; its called pay as you go. Buy more gas pay more tax. One modification—all electric car users should be charged a premium at time of purchase to offset gas taxes not paid.

We already pay high taxes. Reduce spending in other areas. Example,Pers,high public employee salaries and health care benifits.

it is not fair and practical. the fuel tax we pay, if spent soley for road repair should be enough.

I think ODOT is to big, to independant, unaccountable, and the largest waste of resources in the state. It needs a complete dismantle and overhaul before I would consider and road fee increases.

It's nobody's business how much or when I drive. With the nearly dead economy there is less need for road maintenance as there is less use. Any reasonable vehicles in the next several decades will burn taxed gas/diesel, so no need for the change.

1) It could not be implemented fairly. 2) The current assessment of state and fed taxes on gasoline is not fair as it assumes that the gas is used to travel on roads. It doesn't account for farming, boating, etc. 3) Implementing a way to measure road mileage would necessarily introduce additional costs/resources into the equation reducing the benefit. 4) One incentive for purchasing high mileage cars or electric cars is a reduction in gasoline expense so additional mileage charges would take that incentive away.

Bad comprehension on why things work with a bad construct of logic. We pay plenty of taxes. The government is bloated and inefficient. The common man should pay less and less for everything so as to boost their disposable income. The big companies and Government should be bled of their gross mishandling of profits and tax dollars.

Would raise the price of goods being transported, where do you think the truckers get the money to pay more?

it is not the governments business how many miles i drive. too much government control

It's ridiculous! Tracking mileage of a person is a bit too much- I suggest trying another way to tax us to death.

There is no economic benefit to fuel efficient cars (at least for the buyers). Money appropriated for road maintainence is not being used exclusively for that purpose - or so it appears. The people who drive the most are people with modest jobs - salese people, truckers, people who live far from work due to economic necessity -- why penalize them further? If we developed our own natural resources and lowered the cost of fuel at all levels, then perhaps taxing by the mile would make sense. Till then it is just another penalty for survival.

BIG BROTHER! I do not believe that the government has the right to do this.
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We have state and federal highways. Quit paying for illegal aliens benefits and divert the money to our highways, real school reform, and tax reform.

Too much intrusion into people's lives.
More taxes, we're taxed enough!
It's just more government intrusion. We need to get the holier than thou's out of our lives.
It requires more government monitoring and potential control of my life.

There is plenty of money available through taxes that should go for the construction and repair of roads.....about 48 cents per gallon. But much of this money is being diverted for a larger transportation staff, mass transit, bicycle paths....everything but roads and rapir. The road payment formula is just one more tacked on tax. If the gas tax per gallon were dropped in favor of a road payment forula I might go for it. But I am absolutely opposed to transferring more of my income to the government until they show some restraint, and good business practices. At the moment government lacks self-control., and should be deprived of any future taxes until they prove they are good stewards of our tax revenues.

What about bicyclists? Currently they pay nothing for the roads we all use. A true road payment formula needs be broader in scope than giving a tax break to "fuel efficient" vehicles. We also need to be charging owners of these "fuel efficient" vehicles a disposal fee of some kind to help pay for the disposal of the enormous battery each one contains. Where will all those HUGE batteries go when the car is reached the end of it's functional life, as tens of millions will coming soon? What will we do with all the harmful chemicals inside? How do we plan to treat the soil and water that these chemicals contaminate? Who will pay for it all? A real plan needs a broader scope than to pat Prius drivers on the back while saddling everyone else with higher fees.

The roads are for everyone’s use at their choosing. Lowering the cost of road construction and maintaining them has been done and proven to increase the quality in the Netherlands. They eliminated the government agencies and raise the standards of quality and bonding for the warranty of road construction and repair. ODOT has no business doing anything other than road safety and management period. They are over paid, over staffed, over equipped and not motivated to make a profit therefor not driven to higher standards and should be liquidated in those areas.

Let the market, not the government regulate
More government intrusion into our lives
More HORSE MANURE and lies!

Because it is a trick! It is no different then when a city asks its residents to lower their use of water, due to a shortage of reserve. The people oblige. the usage goes down, the "Bills" go down. There are not the funds to pay the employees that maintain the water systems, so the rates go up. That is a "No Win" senario, often repeated throughout our Nation from the Top Down. It is never a "Temporary Raise in Rates" until the average use of water comes back again. The rate increase stays. It is a punishment for compliance, and that is ass backwards! There is no Global Warming, requiring the lowering of Carbon emissions, and there is no potential of running out of Oil, based of Fossil Fuel, as abiotic fuel will always exist. So the American Citizen has been forced to pay more gor fuel, buy more expensive, more fuel efficient cars, and now some even do not need carbon based fuels, and you once more wish to punish for compliance. It is idiocy!

I don't want someone or something monitoring my movements. The very idea of such a thing feels unconstitutional. It makes me think of "Check Point Charlie." What might seem like a good idea on the surface to you will most certainly be used and abused to usurp our freedom. This idea would naturally create another new tax while keeping the old tax in place. NO. Bad idea. Furthermore, the State does not need anymore money. The Oregon State government is the most wasteful of all the states I’ve lived in. Our state government has no self control and has a spending problem exactly like our Federal government.

No. First, road wear is not dependent on vehicle fuel efficiency. So that metric is not directly relevant in the matter of road maintenance. Weight is a direct metric. Trucks already pay more use fees due to that. Yes, weight affects fuel efficiency, but a standard car and a hybrid car may weigh exactly the same and have vastly different fuel efficiency. Therefore efficiency is a poor predcitor of road wear. Second, mileage and efficiency both require some means to track vehicle information—either at the pump or at tax time. It opens many ways to game the system. No one can game the fuel tax at the pump. Simple, elegant, and more importantly, gas taxes are a means to incentivize people to use less. Using less fuel means less dependence on foreign oil, less air pollution, smaller, more efficient cars, and fewer miles driven. Every result of the current gas tax is positive. No need to tinker. To address a lack of funds for road repair, two ideas: 1) People who drive grid-powered electric cars bypass fuel taxes altogether, yet their cars wear our roads same as gasoline powered
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cars. This loophole needs to be closed. If their electricity comes from coal fired plants, these are far from pollution-free vehicles. 2) Stop diverting fuel taxes into the general fund. Spend them only on roads. Problem solved.

The governments of this country already collect too much money from the tax payers and use it to fund their pet social and climate programs. You have enough money already. Quit wasting it. It's a big city idea and disregards that it affects the majority of the state just as if the whole state was in the Willamette valley.

It sucks

I do not want Big Brother tracking me.

First, people are encouraged to buy more expensive cars to be "green" and save gas, then they are penalized for doing so. Doesn't that seem like a slap in the face? On top of that the gas tax itself would not be reduced, ergo, double taxation again. When is enough, enough?

If you used the gas tax just for roads and not bike paths and max trains there should be enough money. Get rid of PEERS and the Unions in Government!

it would probably affect the poor more than those able to pay

We already pay a tax relative to how efficient our vehicles are and how much we travel. It's called the gas tax.

The department of transportation has some 20 engineers assigned to aviation - yet no airport has been built in Oregon while any of them were alive. Oregon DOT is a bloated waste.

penalizes those who live in rural communities

Because you are already taxing the drivers with gas taxes. Find better ways to stop wasting money

NOT UNTIL THE POSSABILITY OF BEING TRACKED IS SOLVED

This is just more government intrusion on the individual. Government taxation and control should only be the last result.

Taxes, fees and fines.

you are punking us american public. it is all bullshit.

What happened to the "This is a Free Country" How much are the pedestrians and bicyclists going to throw into the pot?

I don't like the invasion of privacy that is involved.

Because I already pay enough taxes for roads and I believe the money the state gets is not used wisely. I believe it is taken away and used in other area's than road work.

It is an unfair distribution of the road use support. Lower income people cannot afford the newer high mileage cars and so would be taxed at a higher rate than those who can better afford to pay it. Also this increases costs to everyone since high mileage jobs like trucking, construction and service work would have to pay more, thereby having to charge more to the end user. A better solution is to repeal the prevailing wage system in Oregon which would lower the cost of highway repair and construction.

Because it penalizes the person who has to drive long distances for work. I think it is a really poor idea considering our present eco-nomic situation to add any load to those who are fortunate enough to have jobs.

Our taxes we pay to build roads are currently sufficient if we didn't have such a large government bureaucracy to support and endless studies upon studies instead of building and maintaining roads.

I see it as another form of the government controlling an individuals life

I don't like the idea of big brother knowing what I do. It's no ones business.

The State of Oregon has a .30 cent tax on gasoline today, 14th highest in the USA. Funds have been raided from this fund to pay for other forms of transportation and studies. I would never go for any more complex type of tax base because I couldn't trust dishonest state politicians and bureaucrats to turn it into another taxing boondoggle. To much government would ruin any program and this dream would be a nightmare.

Too intrusive. Fix the problem in other ways - ban studded tires for example.

It's stupid - just let us drive - don't be big brother!

not fair to rural residents and low-income people, i.e. it only takes into account urbanites

more fuel efficient cars are lighter and are easier on roads. I feel the gas tax needs to be spent more efficient.

People should not be forced to drive fuel efficient cars. I can't haul firewood, camper, equipment for work or
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my camper with an electric car. I drive a 1 ton truck that gets 10mpg. It does exactly what I need it to do, and
if I get into an accident I will be safer than somebody in a sardine can.

no need for it WE HAVE A GAS TAX

A blanket policy for payment of roads is short sided. Green cars should start paying for road use based on
miles driven period (efficiency standards need not be applied). Standard gas vehicles, meeting regulations,
should pay using the existing model. Finally ALL “wheeled” vehicles using roads payed for by taxpayers need
to start paying their fair share. This means BICYCLES need to pay. They have been getting a free pass for far
too long. Anyone with wheels using the road needs to pay their fair share. Taxes for roads need to be used for
roads and NOT for other government needs including, but not limited to, bicycle paths and walking paths.
We all need better roads, if we use them or not we all depend on them in many ways...Shipping ect... The
weather damages the roads more than use.

Inequity of assessments and I see this as another means for the state to take an increasing amount of money
from the citizens. These increased funds are then siphoned off to pay for costs of mass transit and other
projects which cannot be economically stand on their own merit. This is simply another means of social
engineering to tax people out of their freedom of choice and into what the political agenda agenda is. If you
take up space on the road, you shoud pay for an equal share of the costs.
The problem is not that people use the roads. The problem is a lack of quality control and efficiency on the
part of ODOT.
The roads in Oregon have been crap for a long time! The six cent raise in gas tax was for what? On which
roads has the state spent the 'other 24 cents' of the tax. The passage of the new tax was just another money
grab by a state that is broke, and possibly always will be.
It would punish rural residents, and would be yet another massive intrusion of government on personal liberty.
because the real use and damage done to roads are the trucks. Also this would be a huge negative impact on
the people who can afford it the least.
It penalizes fuel economy and would be burdensome in reporting. It sends the wrong message. There are lots
of other ways money could be saved. For example, cut out gov’t waste. I see waste all the time in teaching.
Excessively bureacratic
Because it gives OUR government more contol over our lives. I do not agree with Oregon Government officials
wanting to have access to the exact number of miles we drive at specific times of the day. Every time
Government officials say the tax will be a specific number, it always ends up being almost twice as much as
they said it would be.
It creates another government intrusion into our lives, and just creates more government jobs such as
inspectors , etc. We are personally fed up with the mentality of the "green earth movement" which are mostly
incompetent idiots, and all the government red tape being jammed downed our throats. Also, I think this
survey is slanted and full of bias--only conducted to promote a anti -free enterprise agenda.
It’s now of your busines how many miles I drive. This is another Orwellian idea brainwashed into the heads of
our schoolchildren.
It penalizes rural Oregonians. Too much Government control of our lives.
Agenda 21 = Government transportation and high density living which is not the will of the people.
Hybrid cars should pay by the mile.
Currently a gas tax pays for roads, if I am using gas I AM PAYING FOR THE ROADS NOBODY WILL EVER BE
DRIVING ELECTRIC CARS IN MASSES. I already have a car that gets 40+ miles per gallon but have others that
get less.
Once again, it is BIASED!! It is really unfair for the farmer who has to live way outside of town. The whole
formula is tilted to get folks out of their cars & onto Metro. This line of questions is biased.
Having government maggots involved with monitoring everyone.
Just another way to expand gov’t. The gov't gives our tax money to support electric cars then goes to raise the
taxes on those who drive those cars. Stop the whole cycle!
Again, this is an intrusion in every citizen’s right to privacy. To have a Big Brother able to track every drive we
take every day is just another way to confiscate our hard earned dollars. Government needs to get out of the
way and let the economy recover, not find newer more clever ways to take our money.
I do not trust the state government. My expectation is that much of the funds raised would go to such
nonsense as bike paths and light rail projects. We should use the gas tax only for roads. We also need to address the manner in which ODOT spends is money for road construction. There appears to be much waste in the manner in which contracts are awarded and work accomplished.

The costs would force businesses costs to rise dramatically and be a hardship on every consumer. Bicycle enthusiasts should be taxed to help on the costs for roads. Road construction costs could be reduced if the work wasn't subject to the Davis-Bacon act requiring a prevailing wage payment schedule.

Unfair and duplicate tax. We already PAY taxes to maintain our roads. Maybe they should build roads to the specs of the area in which they are building. You don't see "ruts" in the mountain roads and they have far more snow tire traffic than we do in C.O., but, no ruts! It's time they quit building all roads to the same specs. We have different climate and weather here.

The revenue to the state is already there. It's the state that is not using it properly. Adjust the wasste in ways the government does things.

another intrusion by government into our lives; additional government bureaucracy to implement

You can see the writing on the wall here! Black boxes in cars to monitor their activities. What's next? Charging for making turns, how many pounds of groceries. Nope get government out of our lives! Resolve the problem some other way! Hey, why not charge bicycles for road use? This perpetuates government intervention in ourlives and I do not like it! How about we not send our taxes to DC and utilize what we have in Oregon to fix our roads without DC taking a cut for nothing.

Simple, big brother.

Most of the state is rural and it will dramatically punish that rural population!

Uh, everything. What about mileage I travel out of Oregon or on logging roads within Oregon, neither of which will cause premature wear on Oregon's highways and roads. How would those miles be subtracted from my total? Why not increase the gas tax, weight-mile tax, and increase the registration fees for alternate fuel vehicles so they are not being subsidized by gas-powered vehicles. I would fear the state setting some base mileage where you'd pay X amount, then anything over that preset annual total would be assessed at Y rate. I just don't trust state government; the whole notion is thinly disguised social engineering.

you want to penalize commuters? hard working members of our community? people who don't happen to live within the city limits? why is your answer to everything taxing the hard working people?

How would it be implemented? How would you make non-residents pay? A gas tax is the most logical way to fund road maintenance/repairs.

More taxes and unfair

My job got moved 45 miles away a few years ago. This will hit me hard. We pay tons of taxes to repair roads. We have used that money to build waysides and trails and walking for horses. Use the money for ROADS. Cut back on the admin people. By penalizing drivers people will drive less so you get less tax money and all the people, motels, gas stations and vacations spots will get hurt because people are not traveling, so you compound the problem. Taxes are not the solution to everything. We have to cut all of our spending and stick with basic services. We cannot help everyone during these hard times. I have to balance my budget so does the government.
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**39** What changes, if any, would you support to make the transportation system more carbon efficient?

- Weight-mile tax on all vehicles
- less expensive public transit and more frequent service.
- teleworking and homeschooling
- I have a 2010 Transit Connect and I don't even have 10,000 miles on it, taxing will not help
- Repair and improve roads & controls for better traffic flow.
- auto emissions have dropped over the last 20 years. Just let industry keep improving efficiency.
- Tax over the road trucks. Give incentives for buying local.
- Make electric cars affordable

\[ n = 8 \]

**41** Why is farmland protection important to you?

Source of food. Open space.
it is necessary for our food, and need it for our seucity of our food grow locally
Conserving our natural resources from the semi-permanence of development is vitally important. A growth boundary encourages more efficient methods of moving people and goods; and it encourages density.
We need to eat
Because we have lost so much to development, the growing of corn for ethanol and the huge amounts of land being taken up by wind farms that we will not have enough food to feed people if we keep it up.
Food production
A healthy, local food supply is important to communities. Also, large corporate farms may have too much control in what they choose to supply. I think protecting farmland in turn can protect small farmers who in turn are more responsive to us. Selfish answer.
And how do you propose to eat?
I like to eat.
Because Oregon is a rural state and should stay that way.
To maximize Oregon's agricultural economic leverage with other states.
We need food
Simple, we need to eat.
Farmland is where we can grow our crops, it sustains us and it helps balance the climate and carbon in the atmosphere, if it were not protected what would it become? More empty malls and parking lots? Where would the rain go? run off? The aquifers are sustatined by farm and forest lands.
Through political agenda driven policy we (USA) import far too much energy, we need to beable to at least feed our nation!
Farmers feed us. Keep reducing farmland and we'll run out of land to grow our food. Don't do land grabs. If it's farmland.......keep it that way.
Oregon's Willamette Valley has some of the most productive farmland in the world (good climate, relatively free of pests); this is a resource not to be squandered
I want food produced where it is known to be safe. I do not want food from other countries, the standards are not equal to US. Just the pesticides that can be used and how they are used is one example of why our US food is safer. If farm ground keeps getting used for city sprawl there will be no ground to grow food.
local jobs and local produce and for those of us who love the country and hate the ugliness of crowded/polluted/political cities.
Do you want all your groceries coming from Mexico or China or somewhere there are no rules at all? Thank heavens I live in an area that our local commisioners protect from development. The developers have been here, but when it comes to building on our farmland...they get the thumbs down.. Hooray!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Idaho has no such rules and I watch farm after farm paved over and houses grow where crops used to be. No thanks.
Where do we get our food supply? Where would we get our food supply? Trucked in food is not as healthy as locally grown food, nor does it taste as good--as long as they quit trying to genetically change it. Dairy land is important too. We are losing family farms due to too many restrictions, etc. We need to quit subsidizing no growth or controlled crops and get back to basic farming and ranching. Corn should be used to feed people and an abundance of food products could mean lower food prices and fewer people welfare programs because they could afford to feed themselves.
Ok lets look at this logically, we grow it here locally, which means we don't have to ship it in which adds to the "carbon foot", shorter distance from farm to market cheaper for all, cuts carbon out put, or maybe this global warming is just a shame????? Also jobs for the locals not overseas or Mid West
yes,but a land owner has to be able to survive or do something with their land to survive
they produce food and jobs
we need farm land to be used for farm land productio.
We need places to grow food.
It is a wise thing to do.
Farmland is food heartland.
We need food, and grown domesticaly reduces transportation costs.
stop urban sprawl
We have to have a place to grow our food.
The government has dessimated California’s farming land; natural disasters have wiped out the farmbelt of the Midwest. We need to keep our farms preserved and producing - both dairy and agriculture.
The world is getting hungrier!
Good farm land is important but some of the land that is designated EFU is wrong
The more farmland that is gobbled up, the more we have to depend on foreign sources for our food supply.
Community costs for farms are much lower than for a housing development, so it makes sense to encourage farmers to farm rather than change to housing.
Open land is important
Ranches, crop production, timber harvests & management
It’s about being self sufficient. Why would be want to buy our food from somewhere else if we can grow it ourselves?
to prevent sprawl
It is important from the aspect of preserving the ability for farmers and ranchers to produce the goods we are going to consume and still make a living. Oregon is still a largely rural state with a large amount of the population and land dedicated to agricultural activities. Land protection from development and governmental regulations should be a major point of concern to every citizen.
To raise food crops.
We need food and there is plenty of land that is not good for agriculture.
I want locally grown food as much as possible. I don't trust imports from other countries because their ideas of cleanliness and safety do not measure up to ours. A framer cannot produce food economically unless he can do it on a larger rather than smaller scale. So farmland should be protected.
We need to be able to grow our own food and decrease our dependence of other countries.
Important to the cultural heritage of the state and our country. It promotes an independent, self sustaining citizenry.
farmers grow food etc
people need to eat and we would rather raise our own food
Open spaces. Food or natural resources production
REAL farm land is in limited supply. However its only farm land until regulations take away water.
UMMM! Farmlands create food. People need food!
You deplete the farmland and we will have to be dependent on other countries for food which we should not do. Could go into the whole ag thing, not enough time and space.
Protection of our Nations natural resources has been important to me for my entire life. My career was in natural resource management. Paving over or developing our farm land, forest and range lands for non agricultural uses will make Oregon dependent on outside sources to meet our agricultural needs. Government must do more to protect our farm and forest lands and make it easier for farmers, ranchers and forest owners to manage their lands for AGRICULTURE not agro-tourism. Eliminate the estate tax, allow farmers access to adequate water supplies, CUT TIMBER by managing our lands using sound science NOT fake "feel good" science. We can positively affect climate by good ag practices AND have thriving communities with good schools and meet emergency service needs.
Farms feed America
We need to produce for ourselves.
Sustainability. Need for less expansion and therefore less impact by limiting continued increase in infrastructure.
because without farms we will have to transport food from outside the state which will have more trucks on the road.
If we do not maintain famlands in our state or nation, we will become dependent on other nations and will not have any control over what chemicals are used in the production of the food we get.
We get food and income from farmland crops Jobs too!
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I like to eat.

Who's going to feed the nation if we don't have farms? And we are losing family farms every day to
government subsidized corporate farms.

Simple, we must eat. By growing our own food, we do not become dependant on other nations. It would
soon lead to food shortages. In addition, we would have no control over food safety. We must not only be
able to grow our own food, but we also feed the world.

If it's actual productive farmland such as found in the Willamette Valley, then yes. If it's the poor soils on
the east side of the Cascades, I don't feel any compunction to protect those lands. The reason to protect
farmland is to try and safeguard agriculture as an economically viable practice. However, protecting open
space and vistas under the guise of protecting ag is disingenuous.

because land developers are just looking for any way to cram more houses and apartment complexes into
smaller spaces, I just watched the farmland down my street get turned into 140 homes and do you think
the city is willing to put in a street light to help with the growing traffic problem? well, no, they say they
cant because that street is a highway and owned by the state who has no intention of saving any lives from
potential accidents

We need to preserve open spaces, including farmland

Food is important to the world and the best systems do not interfer with farms

we need food more then anything else

I moved here 35 years ago since that time I have seen land that was farmland, growing crops and fruits,
being paved over for warehouses. The land next to the portland airport was at one time growing every furit
and vegatable you could think of. That land was rezoned to commical and sold and now it is paved. This has
happened all over oregon so I have no faith in our land use laws. They are a joke. If a rich person wants the
land for whatever reason they just get it rezones and we/ all oregonians lose. We need food there is lots of
land sitting idle that can be used for warehouses and factories. Once againg comon sense.
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54 Why would you invest in a renewable energy project?

We have solar panels on our home, not necessarily because we will see a return on them in our lifetime, but
because it was the right thing to do and we were able to take part in an affordable project. now we are
looking into other changes to make - solar water heater etc. We try to use less energy, but still are use more
than we morrily should I am sure. There is not one answer to the problem. It takes using less, and using a
better source (solar, etc). I believe having panels visible on our roof is also a statement of our beliefs and
may encourage other folks to try it. If it is in your neighborhood, it if possible and not an article in a
magazine. It becomes more familiar. We find that we are more actively aware of our energy use since we got
the panels. I remember to unplug the microwave, turn off lights, put on a warmer sweater, try a pressure
cooker, wash clothes when the sun is out; so hopefully it has cut our usage in 2 ways: we use the sun and
we use less. we also bought a Prius last year and love it. It has changed our driving habits a bit as well. since
it was a big investment, I am not sure about the 'would you buy an electric vehicle’ ?s. we keep our cars a
long time. But our next purchase might well be all electric. we bought the Prius because we felt it was the
right thing to do and that it was a soundly built vehicle. The tax credits were great, but we were saving for it
anyway- and our cars were old.

I think the trust funds should be used to do this

Because renewable energy sources will literally NEVER run out, and they pay for themselves within a matter
of a few years!

If I had investment funds, I would certainly explore this option

It needs to be done and to make a financial gain.

1. It would create jobs 2. It would create energy 3. After the technology is suffieciently advanced, it would
decrease many other costs for most families

Because you are guaranteeing me a higher than market return on my investment. Only the government of
Bernie Madoff can make such a guarantee. I might also want to invest if it addresses other issues--reducing
US foreign fuel payments, or reducing pollution (as in coal). But not because it reduces CO2. That comes
along for the ride as a result of good energy and economics policy. I’d also invest in nuclear for the same
reasons. Just give me the chance.

for my home I would if it paid off over 15 years
n = 8

**56 Why is local produce important to you?**

you know where it is from and it help the local economy


Because I want my neighbors to be prosperous

Because it is fresher and supports local farmers.

It’s fresher. I’m not concerned with “saving” local farms by paying them more for less, however.

You know where it’s coming from. You (often) get a chance to speak with those who produce it. You know it hasn’t been on a truck for 5 days to get to you.

Usually it is fresher, it doesn’t have to be shipped a long distance so should be less expensive, it helps our local economy.

Quality, carbon footprint, local jobs, taste, health.

This is where solutions should come from, not State and Federal govs. We know what is best for our communities!

It gets here faster, therefore fresher. I think produce from this country is safer, too, than Mexico, for instance.

I don’t like imported foods OR genetically modified foods

Because I have a garden of my own and produce my own food.

Reduced transportation costs, keeping money in our local economies, supporting small producers. Sometimes it’s fresher product, as well.

you know where it came from and creates jobs here

It is about community

It is less likely that they have chemicals etc in the soils. There is a little more accountability if it is local. That is why I have my own victory garden. I just like the idea of it being someone here that grew my food if I didn’t grow it. About the car thing... I answered I don’t know on most of them because I have not looked into it. I might like one of them better than the car I have now... but haven’t done the homework

Better quality, fresher. Also anything local means we have more control over it compared to something from other states or countries.

I buy from known farms and markets where I know what goes into the produce and my body. I grow my own as well, and can foods.

This would help our local economy

Local produce supports local jobs & reduces the amount of energy wasted in transporting that produce to market.

support of local businesses safety quality

Freshness and safety

Fresher and already know the producers and their practices.

Supports our growers

Our family supports local business and local farmers.

Buying locally economic support to the local farming community.

Fresher; generates and supports local businesses

I like to have fresh fruit and vegetables. I always look to see where the produce is grown.

local jobs you know where it is coming from trust relationships within our own commmunities supporting locally

Local means FRESH and since I know what my neighbors grow and how they grow it, I can get exactly what I want. Whether I want peas, onions, portatoes, corn, tomatoes, watermelon or hay for my horse. I know who has it and when it is ready. It doesn’t get any better then that. Where did your last meal come from? Mexico or South America?

As I said before, it would be fresher, more nutritional, have a better appearance, therefore more appetizing
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and would support the local market. I have visited other areas where most of the produce was shipped in-- Las Vegas, for example. I much prefer my food to be grown closer to my table--even from my own garden. If the farmers were free from over-burdensome restrictions and regulations they may produce more. If they were forced to e-verify and hired local children, not illegal aliens, and paid by the pound or whatever measure they used when I was growing up, that would make me even more willing to buy locally. Minimum wage should not be a method of payment. Children need incentives to work hard, it makes them appreciate what they have earned and appreciate when their parents must do to put food on their table.

really who writes this........... Ok I'm convinced that by your really dumb questions global warming is not real................. see the other related answers

It is fresher, supports the local economy, and doesn't require as much energy to transport.

It supports my neighbors and facilitates relationships. I recognize that doing business with neighbors helps foster community.

i like to see the local people make a living

Know the growers, fresher.

better for us

keep jobs local and quality of product

because it is local

You know its origin.

it helps suporhome grown products and not big business.

Purchasing local food would support locat farmers.

Fresher, often cheaper


Because it is fresher, doesn't have to be shipped and there is U-Pick produce and farmer markets locally.

Local economies are strong economies.

Local Jobs and less transportation cost, and no e-coli from afar

It supports jobs in the State.

Should not cost as much.

I want to know where my food is coming from - I do NOT want food produced by a monolithic food giant (like Monsanto) - plus I want to support local growers - for their work, their quality, and to get the freshest possible produce direct from the source, that is ripe and ready to eat. I do not want mass produced food, shipped before it is ripe, held in trucks or warehouses for days or longer.

Many reasons, but the most important is keeping money in the community.

support our local economy

freshness

No E-Coli from Europe.

It is important to me to support any business operation at the local level.

Less transportation impact in cost, road use, fuel and the desire to support local growers and economy.

Freshness and seasonality.

No delivery costs in the supply chain Fewer trucks hauling it Local economy benefits Fewer days from harvest to table means no preservatives required

Again, the standards for production are higher.

Fresher and "right off the vine"; not warehoused or picked green to ripen in storage or at the store

I/we, do our best to support local businesses.

The closer to home it is the fresher it is. It keeps our farmers working. If we can produce our own food why would we want to buy it from somewhere else. It's better than Mexican or Brazilian produce.

Support of local business.

It employs people in my own community

Quality and the support of local farms.
it tastes better and helps the local economy
buy local the money stays local
Freshness and you support your town
Support of local business, regardless of product helps the local economy quite substantially on many levels.
Another stupid question.
It is free enterprise at work. It is a way to drive out into the county. I don't want some damn bureaucrat involved in the process.
 Fresher
It is fresher and it is nice to know where it comes from.
It supports local farmers and the local economy.
Less transport time, better quality, support local economy.
I believe in supporting business where I live and who pay taxes to the same entities that tax me. Also the health and cleanliness issues I stated previously. The US has the highest food standards in the world, I believe.
I creates jobs for my neighbors instead of someone in Mexico.
I purchase it when it is available but do not go out of my way to locate and purchase - feel it's important to support our locals - besides, it usually is fresher and tastes better than that from out of state
Sustains local economy.
to support local taxpayers and to know the producers at a personal level
Economy
Support the local economy
Local farms are important to America.....why wouldn't you want to...
It helps the local economy.
local jobs
I already am in control of my energy usage. I already engage in energy efficiency. I already recycle and don't need government to tell me to do so. I already purchase local produce as well as food produced in other parts of our great nation.
Shorter field to table timeline ... fresher goods which means fewer or no preservatives.
Freshness
Taste, freshness, helping the local economy.
freshness
Fresh and clean
can control how it was grown and how fresh it is
The further away it is grown, the longer it takes to transport it to me.Thus the products are not as fresh or healthy.
I believe in supporting local economies and private enterprise
Better quality and produces jobs locally.
Food costs and safety.
Grown on rural land, creates jobs and income for local farmers and growers
tastes good.
I have ALWAYS bought "local" produce. I only buy foreign if it cannot be grown on the west coast, such as mangoes & pineapple. I grow what I can (in our short growing season) and look for local and in season otherwise.
Support my neighbors.
We have to support the people who work to provide the food we eat. They have lives of hardship and deserve to have the support of the locals.
To keep the local economy viable.
Keeps the money in our area to be recycled.
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Foreign (out of state) produce is not satisfactory, and usually has transportation costs added. Local produce support the local economy.
These are my neighbors and friends!
It is fresher, better for you because of that reason and we support our local economy.
fresher and sweeter and supports local economy
I like to support any/all local businesses to help the local economy.

Locally grown and local farmers produce it. I know the product
I support my farmers and all that is involved in that industry. I know my product and where and how it was grown.
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In your opinion, what is the worst case scenario that could evolve if rules about climate change and reducing carbon emissions go into effect in Oregon?
(Other responses filled in)

ethanol is really really bad for the environment and it takes away food from somebody’s table
More wind farms killing animals & destroying our state.
Potential intrusive taxation or penalties.
We would have to get used to living within new regulations, drivign less for example, and that can be uncomfortable for awhile.
Loss of liberty for myself and my children and grandchildren. This is not a Constitutional function of government.
Government interferarance in my life.
lowered indoor air quality
we need to fous on saving energy not counting carbon
I heard an interview on NPR some time ago with some high ranking DOE emplyee’s taking about carbon trading and the possiblity for abuse. I wish I could tell you who it was. Anyway I don’t trust this method as a result
Steeply escalated costs for business and persons for everything they purchase.
Gov’t waste, keep Gov’t out of everything
More squeezing of our rights
Individual frustrations that come with change
destroy my business
A job killer. Also based on a lie! If you tell it often enough its ststill a lie!
More rules,regulations & government control, more rules,regulations and government control.
more businesses will leave the state
What rules?
Promoting stupid legistation that bloats stupid government on stupid science.
1984!
those that can least afford it will be penalized the most
Wasting money for no payback.
just a bad idea that politicians love
The futility of any additional rules about climate change that do not look at the broader picture or the areas of greatest impact continue to astound me. For example, the citizens of this great nation, all together, emit more carbon into the air simply by breathing in one day than every car driving in America does together in a year.
All of the above, and more
Defining humanly unattainable goals as a pretext to regulate and tax, instead of driving policy based on solid science and national interest.
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More power given to the U.N.
False savings propegated on everyone.
Unintended consequences that actually create more environmental harm.
LOSS of LIBERTY!
Economy will plunge further into the toliet.
alcohol in fuel reduces mileage
rich people get richer
WOULD PROBABLY MOVE TO ANOTHER STATE!!
More tax $ wasted on an idea that has no scientific concensus.
increase public employees and taxpayer burden
It is not needed
Lower standard of living
spike in energy costs
It will make Oregon an even worse business climate than it already is.
GOVT CONTROL; SOCIALISM
Aside from the current 16% unemployment, I suppose 30% unemployment caused by this pointless micromanagement would be worse.
Oregon will remain in recession indefinitely
Econmic suicide for Oregon
Nanny State control of our lives.
allows for even more tax increases in the future
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58 If you could choose any source to get your energy from, what would it be?
You've been vague on the questioning; nuclear for my electricity, oil for my car, wood for my heat.
Different energy source for each application..Stupid question
biofuels that aren't made from food
It needs to be from a combination of sources, coupled with efficiency measures. We cannot rely on one source of energy.
I think we need to keep our dams until we have a full solution and even then I am not convinced that it is a good idea to take them out
A mix is more realistic
I have purchased solar panels. However, a decent strategy will be to maximize the benefits of each source while minimizing their deletrious impacts on the ecosystem and human populations. James Fallows in Atlantic Monthly "believes" that there is a safe use of coal gasses (I need proof). Mininuclear power plants and methane from sewage solve two problems: power while reducing pollution and radiation. Mini-nukes with the latest breeder tech offers the promise of extracting 90% of the radioactive material from nuke warheads and the size and standardization of the plants might make them safer. Hydroelectric, ocean based, and wind are clean, but can kill or endanger wildlife when sited poorly. Geothermal is fine, but what happens to sulfurous water?
probably need a combo of the above and how to integrate together like on the power grid.
fewer people would use less power from all sources
a combination of renewables
hydron
a small proportion from biomass
biomass
Home grid mix of solar, wind, microhydro, based upon local availability and conditions
depends on what the energy is being used for
can't afford to buy anything, I don’t pay taxes as I’m disabled
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kinetics, magnetics
conservation plus on site solar, with surplus to grid.
develop new sources through innovation/technology
monocultures of anything increase risk
BioMass
oil
gasification
OIL
petroleum
First: conservation
the least expensive
zero point technologies...let's get real here
I don't like geo-thermal since it consumes water, and water is in short supply due to population demands.
integrate seasonal advantages of micro-hydro and solar
my choice would be the most cost effective source without government subsidies
oil, gas
why not combo of all
I'd like a coal fired pump in my back yard pumping crude oil to my house directly to my personal gasoline plant from Anwar in Alaska, all paid for by taxing liberals.
This is a terribly worded survey and this is a poor question. I want efficient energy sources that will provide a low cost.
There's nothing wrong with trying wind and solar except the cost, and the fact that neither is dependable.
smarter architecture that uses passive methods
I'm more interested in price than I am with source.
biomass
One source is bad idea need multiple sources
High-tech bioreactors not yet invented -- this is a tough question, Hydro, bad for salmon. Nat. gas, more carbon; methane, be careful, that's a greenhouse gas, etc.
certified low impact hydroelectric
USE LESS-Efficiencies
Need combo if hydro (current) and solar (increase)
We can't get it from just one. It's changing the mix that's needed.
conservation, reduced energy use
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59 Why do you like wave power?
Because we are located close to the ocean and could benefit if it proves to be feasible--we need lots more research to make it practical.
renewable, good for coastal towns, interested in the possibilities/potential of combines wave/wind
The source will never run out.
renewable.
it seems to always be available and is there 24 hours a day everyday year round.
Naturally occurring source of energy; no carbon footprint
clean, renewable
Because we live near the coast and if there was a way to make that naturally work that would be great.
Still very experimental, but a potentially less variable power source than wind, eg.
It's natural and Oregon has the ocean and rivers that can supply power.
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What's not to like?
takes advantage of ongoing phenomenon without displacing as much space as do renewables on-land
With the Coast and its facing wave power would supply the needs of the coastal communities better than any other source and it is right there.
It is renewable.
waves are free
I don't know much about it and I like the idea of tapping into such a powerful natural source of energy, if doing so would not affect tidal patterns or disrupt the natural habitat.
The idea is very similar to hydro. I am guessing on this one too that there will be lost fish. But we should do it anyway
Available for free
just like solar and wind, waves are readily available.
certain areas off the Oregon coast would be ideal for wave power, wave/swell motion is reliable
Interesting concept as long as it does not harm life in the oceans.
This is a source that needs to be developed and further investigated.
Our oceans produce waves in response to the winds that blow over them. There is an enormous amount of energy in these waves, and it is virtually carbon-free.
no pollutants
Abundant and natural source of energy. Would want to capture it in a way that it doesn't interfere with the natural motion of the ocean. Oregon is a coastal state and has vigorous waves on the coast. They are consistent and powerful.
Lower impact. Natural renewable resource.
Renewable
I'd like to see more study about potential impacts, but it seems to have potential as a non-polluting, non-invasive source.
free, unlimited
again using the natural power of the ocean - simply elegant and sustainable
Another tool in the renewables basket. Although filling the entire west coast with buoys is probably not a great idea.
High potential hidden visibility uses natural unconsumed source. Waves will still exist even if some of their energy is converted to electricity.
Because it's a clean, renewable energy resource.
renewable, less carbon emissions, very abundant resource for Oregon compared to interior states
If done properly, think it could be quite low impact; inexhaustible, lots of potential for various types of installations for different sites. Those creepy-crawlers on the bottom of the fiords in Scotland sound fascinating! And the bobbing buoys off the Oregon coast are cool! Again, we need a variety of sources. It is thrilling to see this technology developing. Have wondered how it is apt to be impacted by rising sea levels and stronger storm surges, and have not seen this addressed, though surely someone is working on that.
As long as the method of extraction is clean. Unlimited. However, does raise a question for land-locked countries.
zero carbon emissions...we have a huge coastline available
renewable resource, always available, huge amount of energy available, not very visible
Although it may be too soon to say (ie, environment impacts are not totally understood yet), it also seems to be an infinite source and readily available.
Its harnessing gravity itself, in wave form. Thanks, moon!
It seems like a harmless way to create energy. As long as it doesn't need to be subsidized by the government it should be viable.
Unlimited, and clean. Not reliant on the weather.
less polluting
Appendix N: Survey - Responses to Open Ended Questions

We have lots of waves off our Oregon Coast. Unceasing waves making energy - what is not to like? Another resource we have right here in America that can be taken advantage of. Makes use of natural resources. Its there, the technology may not be there, YET renewable renewable and clean green renewable I think it has clean possibilities. Power is virtually unlimited on the Pacific coast. Although I don't know much of the mechanics of it, one would think that the stormier it is (and colder), the more electricity is generated, matching demand. Like Elvis with his wavy hair - it is cool I'm not really familiar with it but it seems as though it is an energy source that would never run out. New low impact, lots of it Some great technologies out there with great designs for wave and river power. Again all that Moon power through waves going to waste. While more research and testing is needed and should be funded, this could be the solution to power generation on the West Coast. There is no force on Earth as consistent and powerful has the tides so just harnessing a portion of it could provide the majority of our energy needs. I know little about wave energy, other than the fact that it is clean. I just don't know how viable it would be for places other than than the coastal communities. It could address part of our state’s energy requirement. If and when practical, wave power and run-of-river hydro potentially have the biggest concurrent input for the PacNW to augment wind/solar. We have coasts and we also have rivers for run-of-river. Wave has undeniable upside in that it doesn't turn "off" like low flow rivers, nights/cloudy days, calm wind days. Love the concept, understand the limitations (danger to marine systems, cost of construction/maint, limited R&D budgets). The key for renewables is that an honest message needs to be put forth that we need EVERY possible energy output in our future mix. Nothing is a magic bullet out there. it is clean and simple, my concern is unsightly buoys visible from the coast line. clean fewer political fights This is a never-ending source of energy no matter the season. We are near the ocean. Lots of opportunities for wave power here in Oregon. Energy production is a better basis for the Oregon coast's economy than in tourism. cheap (in the long run), clean and will help reduce energy oil imports. Good potential for reliable, affordable energy. Potentially supports an area of the state (coast regions) that could use economic development. Constant/renewable. I don't know an incredible amount about implementation, though. free renewable.. its unlimited, not just "renewable" and does not impact the cost of our food and produce such as corn based fuel does may bring us to respect the ocean more for it’s offerings It’s eternal Waves are so powerful, you’d think there would be an endless supply of energy from them. Although I’m sure there are many dangers in harvesting the energy, I think it should be explored/used. continuous movement of water and tides should be harnessed the waves keep on waving As well as taking advantage of another renewable resource that Oregon has in abundance. the coast needs the
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jobs.
We have an Ocean edge to work with and it seems to be clean...
Available and minimally intrusive.
I will hold my final vote until I hear more about the research
Abundant. Oregon has shoreline.
n = 81

60  Why do you like coal power?
Reliable base-load supply Low cost No waste material
Coal is an abundant resource.
Readily available resource...cheapest and the most used!
Abundant and affordable.
America has more coal than anyplace on earth. We should encourage its use because we own it already.
cheap abundant domestic supply, reliable
we have an ample supply
the jobs it secures
available, cheap
We have unlimited supplies of coal available through out Colorado and other states. Some of it makes oil.
we have lots of coal
cost effective, many different uses
Cost!
It’s cheap and abundant
We have abundant deposits of coal in this nation, and it can be used with minimal health effects. Also it can provide a cheap energy source. A great nation must utilized all of its great energy resources, nuclear, water, coal, natural gas, oil. We can't run our country on wind, sun and wood.....it just doesn't work and is not cost effective.
We have trillions of tons of it.. it is cheap!
Coal can be made into charcoal, and burns clean with little or no emmisions, and can be mined and railed from right here in Oregon, thus creating jobs for our own, which is very badly needed.
We have an abundance of coal, it's a natural energy source meant for just that purpose. The idea of discarding a natural source fuel and "burning" our food crops for fuel is insane.
Local and plentiful.
It one of the most efficient and we have a lot of it.
It is plentiful.
Good back up and natural resource
abundant sources.
Inexpensive and efficient. The US had vast reserves of coal. Relatively clean.
It is cleaner now and cost effective and plentiful in this country.
We have an abundance of coal and it should be used however I would trade for Nuclear.
we have an abundance of coal and it is cheap
Cheap.
America has an abundance of cheap coal. Creates jobs. Deduces dependence on imports.
Its cheap. There are large quantities available in this country. The emisions from burning it can easily controled.
The USA has an abundant supply of coal and it will help us be more energy independent.
It can be a clean enery efficient producer of power and we have lots of coal in the earth
cost effective
It's readily available, if the government would allow it to be extracted, and the media hype is that it's clean energy.
The U.S. has huge reserved of the stuff. Coal mining creates well paying jobs. It produces demand for steel,
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equipment. More coal mining and exports will increase more cargo volume for Oregon’s ports and would also create more business for Oregon’s shipyards.

Same

America has such a large supply. It is predictable.

As I said earlier coal plants in oregon run 99% clean. You can fire them up anytime and you can have power. Yes, even to run your computers. It is cheap and it gives us JOBS. Coal pits are jobs. I would like to say that I would love to have a electric car. Ride the bus like I do when I visit my son in San Francisco. I would park my car and take a train to work. My car is a big investment. Insurance, gas, repair bills and parking what a headache. BUT until you can get the other alternatives down to compete with what we have now Myself and every other American cannot afford to change over. The economy is killing us now. They want to cut my pay again while taxes are going up. I am sinking!!!!

Why do you like wind power?

Because we are implementing it here in Pacific NW, but we need transmission systems. It is so sad to see BPA turning the windpower off.

renewable energy source, low impact, can be localized

The source of the power will never run out. It can be tempermental though.

I think wind is the best option because our country has huge wind assets, especially in the Midwest. The major barrier to utilizing this resource is updating the power grid to the extent necessary to allow this power to reach major cities. Oregon also seems to be fairly well-endowed with possible wind-power sites. It is also clean and not overly complex, although it is admittedly an intermittent source of power.

Clean energy.

Known technology, relatively easy to install/maintain, and no carbon footprint.

It doesn’t kill fish like hydropower and is almost infinite.

wind is abundant and clean. Wind mills are beautiful. In combination with a “smart grid” and innovative methods for storing surplus power, it seems like a perfect power source. It is my understanding that newer slow turning wind power generators pose much less risk to birds than earlier models that spun faster.

Once the wind turbines are in place there are very low input costs and little to no fossil fuel in put to keep the turbines generating electricity. This means that the cost for wind power after the initial investment can be relatively competitive in the energy market.

I think it is an easy, safe, environmentally friendly way to retain energy

it seems to be the cleanest, assuming we can get the power from the turbines to the demand locations efficiently.

Because we have a significant amount of it and the infrastructure is in place.

clean energy

It is unobtrusive to the surrounding environment, and relatively easy to set up. Wind power is reliable

No emissions, minimal environmental drawbacks, advanced enough to implement now, and often provides extra incomes to farmers and ranchers

It’s been used for centuries and it’s efficient and emits little carbon.

Because it is natural and wind turbines can last for awhile.

Clean technology (not focused on petroleum, coal or nuclear technology). Creates jobs, builds a trade, simple technology that taps into existing infrastructure. We live in a state that has various opportunities for wind generation. We can be leaders in this field. Wave tech would rock, we should be using our coastlines in conjunction with a smarter energy grid.

It has a fairly low land impact in its location and improved technology has allowed greater amounts of power to be generated from a single turbine.

Potential to provide manufacturing and jobs to pacific northwest, and additional income to farmers with multiple uses of land.

I like wind power because I think it has a lot of potential in Oregon. We have a suitable climate and enough potential wind to convert into valuable energy. It is a very clean method of creating energy and I think it is one
Appendix N: Survey - Responses to Open Ended Questions

that can be utilized now. Wind power has been used for centuries to complete every day tasks in a very sustainable way. I think we need to look back in history and see the success that people had and consider ways to make them more efficient and competitive for the 21st century.

it is not fossil fuel based. I'm somewhat concerned about solar power because of the energy and resource intensive process of creating panels.

relatively small impact (as compared to fossil fuels) and not sun-dependent in our rainy part of the world

Once the wind infrastructure is in place it requires only minimal hydrocarbon use to maintain.

It's renewable and it happens almost all the time and you could build wind towers on tall buildings

I like renewable energy and wind is renewable. I also know better batteries are required to store the energy wind produces.

seems to be the most steady, reliable, universal power source

it's a renewable

No pollution, once installed it is relatively low cost, provides opportunity for green jobs, can be small scale or large.

I'm also excited about solar power, but I'm hoping it advances to be able to capture more energy more efficiently, and finds away to avoid using limited resources in its fabrication. I think both wind and sun have a great capacity to be used throughout the state, and provide additional income sources for farmers, ranchers, and rural communities.

It seems like a relatively easy resource to harness (the wind is blowing whether we use it or not).

It's readily available and doesn't have waste products like coal, gas or nuclear

when wind farms are carefully located in certain areas, power is renewable and doesn't contribute to global warming like coal-fired plants

it's a renewable resource that doesn't have to effect the environment.

The source is fairly reliable in many parts of Oregon and the power could be used locally.

Wind is always available and is totally renewable.

With the wind through the Columbia Gorge, it would be an efficient source of energy extraction.

it has issues regarding sound pollution/land use and adverse conditions for birds, but overall seems to be one of the more efficient energy sources

Clean, readily harnessed

Seems pretty clean, but I do have concern for bird life and bats.

clean. we have already some installed.

It is a constant source with minimal environmental impact.

Renewable energy with limited environmental impacts and zero carbon impact after installation.

Less chance for catastrophic failure (vs nuclear), does not require continued drilling/mining into habitat (vs natural gas, geothermal, coal), less chance to affect wildlife (vs hydroelectric, coal), can be used on a local scale.

Along with solar energy, wind is a resource that does not have to be stripped from the land. Although it comes with it’s own issues (particularly disrupting bird behavior), it seems to be a effective alternative to non-renewable resource extraction.

It is nearly carbon-free, and the wind blows whether we use its energy or not!

It is available to anyone and is something that could become sized and priced for individual home use.

no pollutants generated during generation of power

Clean, relatively small impact on human and environmental health. Prefer less impactful sources like geothermal.

Renewable, low impact

Low impact (provided bird + bat fatalities can be controlled) and renewable.
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Oregon has a steady supply along the coast and in the gorge
does not create emissions, does not require extraction
Untapped (well, under-utilized)source of natural energy with the least amount of drawbacks.
it is so elegant and natural - usually the power the wind
It's available!
Clean, low-impact, totally renewable
It does not create a harmful biproduct.
sustainable and relatively low impact if sited appropriately.
Low pollution once installed other than visual
Because it's a clean, renewable energy resource.
renewable, less carbon emissions, could be used in tandem with Montana/Wyoming wind generation
Lots of potential for development here; fairly mature technology (although I suspect more R & D will create more options soon), can feed into a smart grid to allow for lots of distributed input.
Because it doesn't use up energy to produce more energy.
The wind blows a lot, and it doesn't have time off or time out.
Its Clean
I know that it is not without its particular set of problems, but it seems to be one good idea to invest more money into research and using wind power. I'd much sooner live near a wind turbine than a Trojan or a Fukushima nuclear plant!
renewable resource, and wind farms can look pretty cool, compared to, say, a coal fired electric plant.
The energy is already in the wind. We are just converting it.
When compared with fossil fuels, wind power is essentially harmless to the environment. It creates jobs and revenues for farmers and land-owners.
because it is easy to procure and is a good, clean source of energy. There are detractors of course, but out of the choices, I feel it is one of the best ones to make.
because we have a lot and it's from God.
The amount of power generated with very little pollution generated, mainly transportation and parts.
Highly renewable, few negative side-effects.
I love the idea of getting something for nothing and although there are upfront costs that is essential what you get from wind.
It is readily available and renewable.
It's free and readily available. Capturing and utilizing wind has no impacts on other species' survival.
Clean, lower environmental impact.
Why not?
Don’t ask dumb questions, it degrades the survey. A non-toxic naturally occuring resource that (so-far) cannot be degraded or "used up" or "owned", but rather is a resource of the cpmmons that cannot be co-opted - this time.
Unlike our other resources, such as drinking water, soil, etc.
less polluting
I don't like the landscape it has created around the Columbia basin and eastern Washington but it appears to be producing alot of electricity. I hope it pays off as a good investment. The jury is out on it.
It is practical and efficient.
The idea is great if we could make it economically viable. Low pollution.
If you can use it, and capture it, without gov intervention, do it.
It’s cost effective to produce, and available.
It seems like it is a way to get energy from the earth with little damage to the planet. I think a variety of options would have to be implemented though.
renewable
it is cheep
Renewable and clean
It works
Relatively "clean" although not without its unique impacts (noise, bird mortality, etc.).
Free air - Very expensive
It's clean, it's already successful and some of the nation's best, cheapest wind sites lie along major existing power transmission corridors close to Oregon's population center.
It's clean and proven to work.
Its cleaner
As PART of the formula in the right areas it is non toxic. But there are better designs than the huge wind farm model.
It's a constant.
In the right situation, electricity can be produced in remote areas and reduce transmission distance. Also provides farmers, ranchers and other landholders with added income.
Low pollution
it is the healthy way to get your energy and oregon has alot of wind.
Again, wind power is clean. However, I'm not sure about the capacity of suppliers to provide enough carbon material to make the blades on a massive scale.
Its natural and quiet and renewable. Yes, I hear the arguments about the blades but its clean clean clean. My parents and grandparents grew up in the Midwest with windmills running the generators. no pollution.
It is a "constant" source with little impact on the environment. It would be interesting to know the impact (environmental) of producing any of the hardware to capture the energy.
clean
It's renewable and it's clean, and in some areas, it's abundant.
Just because it is available, especially in parts of Oregon. However, it costs more for the infrastructure to transport wind power to where the populace is.
clean
It uses a resource that is never used up. While some environmental concerns have been expressed, e.g. impacts on migrating birds, when cited in good locations the impacts are minimal. It seems like wheat growers in Eastern Oregon are benefiting immensely from allowing windmills on their land. It's a win-win. We have locations where wind farms can be built without blighting scenic areas or significantly harming birds. It seems like the technology has advanced to a point where it is cost-effective and reliable.
free, works at night to recharge electric vehicles at night
It is non-poluting, other than visual impact.
Can be done with minimal impact on wildlife
It seems to have potential.
it is cheap (in the long run), energy efficient, clean and will reduce our reliance on oil imports.
Affordable, and relatively benign
We have a lot of windy areas and it makes sense to harvest the energy, similar to solar. Many decades ago prior to electrification infrastructure water was pumped from the ground using windmills; today we can do the same with electricity generating windmills. It is all part of the solution.
One benefit from increasing carbon in the atmosphere is the more dynamic weather systems that we experience. Wind power utilizes the dynamic weather systems. In effect it turns a problem (carbon dioxide in the atmosphere) into a benefit (exploiting the increase in weather energy systems to generate power for human consumption).
Low fossil fuel emissions, relatively cheap to install for a renewable technology. Can be placed strategically. They also look pretty cool. Just have to find a way to keep the birds/bats away.
clean and renewable
no carbon
It seems very low impact, and wind is not a finite resource.
Wind is plentiful and is a good, clean energy source to tap. Windmills have been around for centuries. New advancements in technology make them more efficient and they can generate much more electricity. I think windmills look cool too and they do not have many harmful effects on ecosystems.

It is the most cost-competitive renewable resource.

It’s not dangerous like nuclear and emits fewer GHGs in its production than solar panels. I also enjoy watching the turbines spin peacefully in the wind.

Beautiful to drive past

Because it is clean and reliable. Can be decentralized.

It’s clean and always windy on the coast. Watch out for the birds though!

I like the idea of using what is already available.

It appears to be a relatively pure form of energy (minus issues with the turbines and birds [although I know windows are a far bigger offense for them]).

renewable clean improvements make it more appealing

feeds the electric grid without releasing additional carbon

Wind power is easy to build and would take advantage of something that Oregon has in abundance.

It’s available and with tech improvements not so detrimental to migrating birds.

It is a less expensive renewable energy source which can be developed immediately

Renewal with little impact on the environment. I do have concern about impact on songbirds.

It's renewable
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**64 Why do you like nuclear power?**

Reliable base-load generation Low cost Minimal waste material

it is clean and reduces the need for oil

Cheap and reliable energy.

Most bang for your buck with the least risk. Nuclear disasters and their toll pale in comparison to potential mass extinction from use of carbon/coal based power sources. Other options would be better (solar, etc.) but the technology isn't yet there to compete with nuclear technology's efficiency.

Low carbon emissions. Provides baseload power.

I don't like it - but it's cost effective for consumers.

Power does not depend on wind or the sun, and it can be regulated to answer the demands of various times of the day. And nuclear power plants are safer today with current technology than ever before.

Overall it's safe, clean and relatively cheap -

If you want no emissions, nukes are a good way to go.

Best bang for the buck

Abundant and affordable.

Reliable, inexpensive, scalable with new technology.

low carbon... don't like the idea of the waste

The efficiency of Nuclear Energy

Check in with Oregon State University on this. They have great ideas on modern nuclear power generation. Much smaller than the nuclear plants built 40 or so years ago. It is clean and renewable.

only sensible option in the medium term to supply Oregon's main energy demands - until fusion comes along

It is the most efficient, cleanest and cheapest

reliable domestic energy, relatively cheap.

clean, no carbon

It can be done safely and is a longer term solution for a new and practical source of energy.

It is clean and reliable.
The new nuclear is safe and I believe if laws were changed to make it possible to reuse nuclear waste the disposal problem wouldn't be such a problem.

Well, that's a little harder to say, because I don't understand it too much, but my husband understands it very well and says it is very efficient and I respect his knowledge and opinions.

It is cheap power.

It's a cleaner and I feel a safe source

Because it is safe, unlimited in abundance, and is the cheapest per kwh. But the propaganda machine has been effective.

Seems like it has the most potential with the least amount of environmental degradation. Not ready for prime time yet. Must have excellent regulation and regulators. Must use common sense and wise engineering, instead of what is best for profits. Must upgrade or eliminate many old or unwisely placed nuclear power plants. could be done correctly, more bang for the buck. no pun intended.

It's efficient.

I like the new design. Particularly the joint venture between Idaho and the Uof O. This safe modular design eliminates the risks we have seen in the past like Russia and Japan. This design is safer and cheaper not requiring water cooling. It incorporates a gravity design on the fuel rods in place of cooling water.

Low impact to community, scalable. Cheap when fuel is reprocessed as in France.

Clean, safe, huge output

Cheap, efficient

Unlimited potential, efficient,

Very efficient, clean and safe way to produce MASSIVE energy.

Efficient,

Inexpensive

It's an efficient use of our resources.

Baseload, small area for power plant, very little visual impact (especially if cooling towers aren't needed. Doesn't slice birds, doesn't flood river valleys, releases less radioactive material than coal plants. Works at night, in the calm, pretty much unaffected by weather.

The improvement in the construction of nuclear power plants is outstanding, and we can have lots of cheap electricity. Also nuclear power plants are much smaller, and self contained, and could allow regions or areas to be off the grid and run independently. Nuclear power provides 80% of the electricity for France. We could do that in the U.S. and Oregon, if we would grow up. We have about 100 ships and submarines running around the ocean without incident. Let's start utilizing this source of power.

Cost effective,

Safe and relatively clean

Clean and efficient

Nuclear (and it's vastly improved successors) is essential as it is the only viable source with the necessary scale to make a dent in foreign consumption and to replace coal and gas. Solar turns off at night. The wind dies down. Then what? What fills the void? Be serious. Our future well-being is at stake.

As demonstrated by our military, it is safe and efficient.

It has changed and now it can be safe and be done almost anywhere it is needed and would be the least expensive.

Clean cost effective power source that has become much safer over the years.

Cost

It is safe and very efficient.

Safe, non-polluting, and efficient.

Cheap and domestic

Low cost and safe

It is a clean, relatively inexpensive and safe form of energy with today's technology. After serving aboard a nuclear powered submarine for 4 years in the US Navy I am 100% comfortable with the security and safety of nuclear power. The US has fallen behind the rest of the industrialized nations in our use of nuclear power and
there is very little reason for this considering the quality of reactors and their records in the US to date.

cool idea

Very in expensive and it is a renewable source

Nuclear is cheap and reliable. For those who would point to the disaster in Japan, those reactors are very old and were already scheduled to be shut down soon. New designs like the one from OSU are cheaper to build and MUCH more reliable and safe. Comparing the old Japanese reactors to modern designs is like comparing a 1970's electric typewriter to and iPhone.

Clean and efficient.

Frankly, I don't like nuclear (for all the obvious reasons), but I accept it as a necessary component in the carbon-free electrical portfolio that we now need. I am also aware that nuclear technology is now far more efficient and safer than it once was. I would simply ask that plant construction and inspection standards be more rigorous, and that the United States move ahead with the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository.

It is clean, safe when properly sited and designed, efficient and leaves the smallest footprint.

Nuclear is very efficient and dependable form of energy. The safety record of American Nuclear power plants is far better than of any other major power source. For example, after over 30 years the death toll from Three Mile Island still stands at 0. In the meantime, almost daily we can find an instance where people are killed in natural gas or other fossil fuel explosions. Even in Japan, only 2 deaths have occurred from the Nuclear Accident compared to 20 at the Oil Refinery explosion the day of the earthquake. If a magnitude 9.0 quake had hit a gas fired plant we wouldn't be worried about evacuating 100's of people as they would all have been killed in the initial explosion. Imagine what a quake that size would do to the dams on The Columbia. The nuclear waste issue is overblown and can be solved. The fact is nuclear power plants create a finite amount of waste that can be contained and stored safely; unlike coal plants whose waste is toxic and uncontrolled.

clean, long lasting and minimal enviornmental impact

Clean if done correctly

It is a good power source and could create jobs. It is as safe as anything else.

Its efficient and has minimal emissions

Reliable, safe, and expandable supply/availability.

it is clean

continuous energy source

Efficiency

Cheap.

Clean, safe, cheap and nearly unlimited supply. Last I read we have a billion years worth of supply. The newer plants (which America isn't allowed to build) are extremely safe and efficient.

Because I do not think it is 'evil' as some say. Strict regulations and precautions need to made in the construction and management of nuclear plants, making nuclear energy safe.

Because it is clean and the most efficient energy source. Many uneducated folks use scare tactic and rumors to try and place more reactors. It is by far, one of the safest and most reliable sources of energy in the world and many, many nations are using more brainpower than we in the US.

Its clean, cheap and sage when the plants are built properly.

Same.

very effient

It's gotten a bad name due to a few mishaps which were horrible. But many countries in Europe have been using nuclear power for years without incident. It's more likely that nuclear power will be able to be produced without harming the environment, as they claim about fossil fuels.

Cheap power. Nuke plants provide the state with a steady power source during low water years and low water seasons, which effect hydro power production.

It has been proven to be cheaper and when properly build, it is unlimited.

Same

Is safe, takes a small foot print of land, and predictable.

It's the least expensive form of electricity.
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EFFICIENT

It has been in use in Europe for years. Also the middle East. Proper contols will insure clean affordable power
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66 Why do you like hydroelectric power?

Reliable base-load supply Low cost
Because we have so much water here in Pacific NW>
it is cheap and renewable
It uses what is already there and the source of its power will never stop
Plentiful supply. Cheap, clean energy.
Already in place and relatively easy to maintain. Also, no carbon footprint.
It’s what I have to use here for my electricity. If I lived somewhere else I would choose what is the lowest cost most available for my home.
i don’t like it, geothermal and solar are better options. It is better than fossil fuel options. I think that we shouldn’t increase our hydroelectric generation, just improve it and phase it out more slowly than coal, natural gas, and nuclear
although it is not without problems, it is a much less damaging solution than other major players - particularly fossil fuels and nuclear
It is cheap, renewable, provides flood control,
It’s clean, the major capital investments have already been made, and it is the most cost-effective method of energy production currently known to man. Shunting water around existing turbines to replace it with wind power or something else seems ludicrous.
If done appropriately and in moderation, hydro power has a better ability than any other "renewable" power source to provide consistent power generation.
Already exists in northwest, so requires no new construction. Low carbon impact.
Cheap, stable and I like dams.
Hydroelectric uses natural resources to power up. It is dependable, unlike solar/wind power.
It is truly renewable.
I live near a river
It’s one of the few sources of energy that has pretty lights.
In place. Make the wind farms buy into transmission cost.
Clean, renewable, inexpensive, scalable, proven technology.
In the Pacific Northwest, it’s plentiful and cheap.
we have it already and there is no need to raise funds for it
We have already built the dams. It has a lot of embodied carbon and water in it. The electricity is practically free. All energy forms will have their downsides. I see the dams as having fairly small downsides compared to the benefits
cheap minimal impact
because existing hydroelectric power plants don’t shut down during times of maximum demand
It is the ultimate green energy. Gravity and water creates energy and here in Oregon we have both in abundance.
clean. We have plenty of resources
It is pollution free and has been a great source of cheap electrical power.
It is very nearly carbon-free. However, it comes with a steep price in terms of our native fish populations.
Cheap renewable energy
Green energy. Many of the negative impacts of dams can be mitigated reasonably.
renewable and consistent source of energy. sustainable if developed with environment in mind.
We have it in abundance in the NW. By simply doing a better job of maintenance, we can produce more, I have seldom seen all turbines running at any of the major dams. And we need to show the movies of how these
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dams were created, how they fulfilled the vision and brought abundant power to the NW using what we now call stimulus money and how they were built by employing workers that could not find jobs and came in on time and on budget. The dams should teach all a valuable lesson about how we, the people, can and should build an infrastructure and create jobs with tax money that will build a stronger America and how it has worked in the past and it will work again and shout down the "climate cranks" by telling them the fact that creating a robust infrastructure that can survive when petroleum is scarce is critical to our economy and to our survival and if we need to think about how we cannot anticipate natural disasters so we need to be ready to take care of our fellow man with sister city evacuation preparedness networks.

Because it’s a renewable energy resource.
Because Oregon has lots of water and dams with electric energy generation.
reliable, clean, renewable by definition, no carbon emission
Lower cost and use of a natural resource.
renewable resource, plus dams provide other benefits, such as flood protection and recreational areas
Clean, it’s forever.
Clean and eternal as long as the river flows
It is clean and reliable.
It is renewable and is using natural water to create power.
Because it works, because it’s already there and because it’s clean.
It is renewable and produced in Oregon
in oregon it is one of our best natural resources
cleaner and cheaper
mega-dams are a problem but there are other systems which use hydro power that do not have the negative impact of dams
it is cheap and installed
available, cheap
it’s earth friendly, I feel.
We have lots of it, it is cheaper than other sources of power.
minimal impact on nature
Renewable, clean, plentiful, cheap
Efficient. Leverages a natural resource and can be done with minimal ecological impact.
It works and its clean and has been proven efficient
It is plentiful and renewable.
dams are already in place
The water runs all the time, we should be putting water wheels in rivers to run generators like the wind ones.
It’s cheap & efficient and renewable.
harnesses water, clean, and seems cost effective. I’d like to see the technology utilize ocean waters.
minimal effect on environment and low pollution.
We have an abundant source of running water here in the NorthWest
Duh!
totally renewable
very efficient use of natural resources
It’s cheap and renewable.
It’s clean and renewable.
it is clean and cheap and does not put carbon into the air
It’s cheap and reliable
Clean, renewable
Because we have an abundant source of water, and dams, and they should be utilized to the fullest extent.
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Green, cost effective renewable energy
It is renewable... rains, snows, melts, runs into rivers through dams into ocean... energy cannot be create nor destroyed... remember that in chemistry and physics and geology and biology???? It is suppose to be cheap and a never depleted source since in goes in a circle.....
It is most efficient. It creates water usage for farmlands that can be controlled. It helps to control flooding of our towns and cities and homes.
Because we have an abundance of water, it's always flowing, never stops, never will. It works. "If it ain't broken, don't fix it."
To the extent it exists, it is clean, and predictably runs 24/7, unlike wind/solar. But I do not favor building more. So I added geo-thermal and nuclear.
Renewable and plentiful.
It's clean, readily available and is in place now is cheapest
The ultimate in renewable energy and a good, clean, cheap source of power. The side effects of hydro dams is flood control.
It is clean and renewable.
Cost
It is ReNewable!
It's renewable, it's abundant, and it's cheap.
renewable
It is an environmentally produced energy that is in place already
its a natural and renewable resource that doesnt require subsidies to be viable.
Good cheap energy.
It's clean
Because flowing water is the cheapest form of energy that exists.
Just a water wheel in a river and gets a lot of power. However do not know why it costs so much.
It is clean and low cost.
Because it is already in place and we have water all over.
It is cheap and renewable energy. Many dams are already in place so we have already paid for the infrastructure. The impact on fish has been addressed and fish populations are doing well.
Clean and efficient.
It's clean and it's already built.
It's not likely to disappear or "run out." If we don't sell it all to California, there would be a constant supply.
more than power, recreation, transportation, flood control, irrigation
It's clean and probably least expensive.
It's clean and has worked well for Oregon so far........
It's clean and it won't run out, unlike natural gas and coal.
Clean and relatively cheap source of electricity.
Environmentally friendly and inexpensive.
It's the ultimate renewable energy production source!!
common sense for the Northwest
it is much more efficient than other renewables like solar or wind.
Its renewable and cheap. It works when the suns down and the wind is'nt blowing.
Because it works. Rivers are flowing naturally, so take advantage of it
It is clean, and should generate more power, then it consumes reaching the end user.
it is RENEWABLE STUPID!
It is clean, it is efficient, it costs less to produce, it's foot print on the land is less than many of the "green" energy sources being developed. Most of all we as Oregonians are fortunate to have and abundance of it with existing infrastructure to deliver it.
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it currently exists
Availability to the region. Use of a natural resource that does not change the quality of the resource.
We have the resources and technology to economically produce and distribute it
cheap power
availability of small flows of water—even in present major hydroelectric systems (e.g., installing microhydro units in canal that move water to major generators...as in the North Umpqua Hydroelectric Project); newer technologies to generate, store, transmit electricity
Renewable, clean, dependable and inexpensive.
cheap renewable clean infrastructure inplace
It’s why we have historically had the cheapest electric rates in the Pacific Northwest. And now some idiots want to take out the dams.
It is renewable and inexpensive.
Renewable resource. Clean.
clean
Because it is cheap.
It’s the only GREEN energy we have that is cheap and renewable. Unlike wind power that only works when its windy. Solar is too expensive
It’s here.
Cost effective
It is a renewable resource; God gives us rain and snow for us to use to the best of our ability.
no carbon foot print
Cheap power coupled with improved navigation as well as additional opportunities for irrigating farmland.
It is readily available and abundant in the northwest if not hindered by law suits from environmental groups.
It is accessible and cost effective to produce.
It is clean, comes with the natural ecology. It is here.
While it comes with some environmental consequences, it provides a consistent source of power that is affordable.
kind to the environment; cost efficient; already exists and Oregon has plenty of it
windy energy is not efficient enough and tower maintenance will be intense in the years to come
non polluting
Low fossil fuel emissions, stable amount of energy harnessed.
because there are few carbon emissions (now that the dams have been built) and it is renewable. The salmon issues need to continue to be addressed. and it is affordable.
One capital investment, amortised over the life of the damn!
Very cost efficient.
dispersed smaller hydro facilities that are fish freindly
It is green and more predictable. Plus it provides flood control. If a dam has to go remove the Bonneville first so the valley folks can learn first hand why it is there.
Fairly clean and the infrastructure is already in place.
water's already flowing
I like it because carbon emission is not a by-product. I don't like it because the over-use destroys too many river systems, devastating salmon runs. I'm aware that hydro relies on snowpack, expected to diminish in the future. So we can't count on more hydro.
It's cheap, and has proven effective. Our strong water cycle has allowed us to produce cheap power from hydroelectric dams in Oregon for many years. We should keep it up because it works. We should also supplement with other forms of green energy, most important are wind and solar!
Abundance of hydroelectric already exists in Oregon.
it's better than coal/gas for the environment--but not for the fiish! I'm not sure about HP
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It's better than burning coal
What I mean by hydroelectric power I guess is more properly called Hydrodynamic Power, this is more like a system of mechanical Cilia that generates power under the surface of a river. No Dams. See pdf: http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/50510/1/me450w07project19_report.pdf
IYTS CLEAN AND RENEWABLE!!
The waters are always running. We do have some dry years but on the whole those turbines are turning. Also we have really worked on the fish runs and the salmon and steelhead runs are great.
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68 Why do you like natural gas power?
Reliable peaking-power generation Low cost No waste material
According to recent reports we have plenty of it. It is cheap and available and clean with little modification of current technology.
Less expensive, more availability, clean, easy to use.
Clean, abundance, and a natural resource.
Abundant resource.
Natural gas is readily available and a natural resource in America
Abundant, reliable, relatively clean, relatively inexpensive.
Proven efficiency, Abundant reserves
We have plenty of it
If government would allow more domestic exploration it would be a cheap plentiful reliable supply of energy
Its clean and efficient as long as its piped safely.
cleaner than other alternatives, plentiful fuel
renewable resource, clean, always available (unlike wind, solar)
price & availability / NW owned company / not an investment opportunity for another Enron or Scottish Power
It is clean and reliable.
I cook with it, I heat my water with it, I dry my clothes with it. There is a natural gas line in Alaska, so it is American and I like supporting American.
we would be able to have it supplied at a reasonable cost
natural God given
could be available, cheap
Its a proven energy source. I hope more exploration and development of this resource is developed in the US to eliminate our dependence from outside suppliers. More Natural gas in the states will bring our energy costs down.
natural gas is a abundant resource that is not being used
we have enough for 200 years
Cheap, abundant, efficient
clean, available in abundance, low cost
clean burning, we have resources here in the states.
We got lots of natural gas
We have an unlimited amount of natural gas and it's clean and inexpensive.
It too is relatively clean and there is lots of it.
It's plentiful in America.
It is cheap and plentiful.....at the moment.
lower pollution and readily available now
We have a huge supply of it, and it is a very clean, efficient and cost effective fuel. In the long run, no other source will be able to compete with gas cost-wise. Hydraulic fracturing is nothing new. It has been done in a clean manner for years. It needs some simple regulations, and we should be able to develop substantial resources.
Available right here in the USA
It is near oil reserves
It is available right here in Oregon, and burns clean, no emissions, power conversion to electricity can be built near the sites, and it creates sorely needed jobs for the Oregon Citizens.
Local and plentiful.
We have a lot of it and it is clean.
Cost effective and a domestic energy source.
Cost
It is plentiful,
Very abundant in the US, easily used for stationary devices, safe, and cheap.
abundent
its a natural resource
Its clean, and very efficient for use in many applications. We have a lot of it, and would have access to more if the Federal Government and special interest groups
what else can I say - "Natural" gas
very abundant.
Natural gas is clean and abundant. It is also more local than other energy forms.
Inexpensive and clean. The US has large reserves of natural gas.
It's clean and convenient and for the most part safe.
Lots of it
It is plentiful in this country, clean, efficient and inexpensive.
We have an abundance of Natural gas reserves in the USA, it is cheap and clean.
Cleaner than oil, and coal.
Lots of natural gas
economical and burns cleaner than coal.
There is an abundance of it and its cheap
Natural gas is abundant, we have the technology, and if we pursue it in a big way the cost will come down
Cheap.
Abundant supply- thus dependable and cheap. Creates American jobs.
Because large 'gas' fields have been discovered in our northwestern states. Why not take advantage of it?
cheap clean bountiful infrastructure in place
We have large supply available and will help us to be energy independent.
Same.
We have unlimited reserves of NG available to us
lots of it in the ground, cost effective
large supplies
Again, it’s a product that could produce millions of jobs if the government were to allow it’s extraction, and it is readily available.
It is another proven source that we have a great deal of an whose production benefits the economy.
We have it here!
It comes with the same drilling that goes with oil drilling.
Same
America has a large source and predictable.
Natural gas is essentially methane (and possibly other low MW hydrocarbon). It’s preferable to coal and oil but is otherwise just a compromise with the reality that we still burn a lot of carbon. So I’m not very enthusiastic about it if there are better choices.
Natural gas is available in the United States.
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It is all over the place cheap and these Steam powers plants are great. we have them all over here. Natural gas is very abundant. And we get more jobs here from the gas fields to the Plants. we put americans to WORK.
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**Why do you like solar power?**

There are so many small ways to implement it without having to have transmission lines. A neighbor heats the water for his house with it.

renewable energy source, low impact, can be localized

It might not work in Oregon, but it works and the energy will never run out in the near future. When used to heat water and built environments, the embodied energy is very low. When used with low-voltage DC systems, we can provide the lighting we need without expensive inverters and thereby keep costs down.

renewable. Not detrimental to the environment, for the most part.

A naturally recurring source of energy coming to Earth, whether we utilize the technology to generate electricity or not. Also, no carbon footprint.

doesn't kill fish or birds, doesn't produce carbon or pollute the air, uses a naturally occuring resources that doesn't seem to have any negative side effects that I can see (tho perhaps the production of the solar cells themselves has some environmentally deleterious effects?)

It wold be hard for west Oregon but east Oregon almost has an over abundances of it. and it isn't goal, natural gas, and nuclear

It is value-added. PV can function longer than the usual warranties. Modern solar thermal is incredibly efficient. There are also hybrid systems, with PV on top and thermal underneath. This can increase the efficiency of PV in high-temperature conditions. Solar energy is distributed energy, more resilient than one big source which could go out at once. It is my understanding that solar in the Portland area peaks in production at times of peak use pretty well. This bodes well for decreasing the use of dirtier energy production.

because it doesn't create the ecological interference that wind and water power do. It's a power that we can count on and a quickly advancing technology

I am not wholehearted in my embrace of this over other types, but generally I appreciate solar because it seems to require less infrastructure than wind power, it can be scaled down to the individual home, and it is often most effective in areas where people and wildlife do not thrive, i.e. deserts.

it is manageable on multiple scales (industrial and home), it is easy to maintain once installed, it looks good, it doesn't have ongoing side effects like carbon emissions

As close to truly renewable as possible, although the impacts of manufacturing solar technology are not insignificant. I see opportunity for both large scale and small scale installations and to concentrate multiple uses in one area (for example both parking lot and solar PV panels; rooftop & panels, etc.). I also see benefits to on-site power generation, rather than needing to transfer power over distances.

Because it is a passive source of energy source. It makes perfect sense to use the largest and safest and FREE source of energy production.

unobstrusive (on roofs?) not like wind farms. Familiar with it.

Easy, free, environmentally friendly way to gain energy. Its simple and clean

It does not have limits and side effects are minimal

Because it is a renewable resource and we have local manufacturers

it is the most natural way to power the earth. solar hot water systems are very efficient. it can be collected and utilized in passive ways which are much better/smarter(and more challenging to design) than solar hot water and ov systems

clean, renewable

Because it's both renewable and can be extremely local

It can be elegantly incorporated into architecture without obscuring how buildings look. For
example, they can be put on the roof, or sides of buildings, where space is relatively unused anyway.

No emissions, inexhaustible, fairly well developed already. I hear that smaller, distributed systems are better than huge arrays like the ones they’re building in southern California’s deserts, but I don’t know enough about that to have a firm opinion.

The sun comes out every day (even if we don’t always get to see it).

With the proper battery storage, we can be independent from the grid on most days, even on gray Oregon days.

It’s carbon light, it provides energy from the sun. I have a unit on my roof and it has proven to be a great way to get power for a relatively low cost—due to energy credits....

Because it is natural and the sun won’t run out of power.

Because it’s there. It doesn’t require dangerous extraction methods, doesn’t pollute, and is easier to see the connection between supply (production) and demand (consumption).

Solar has a flexibility unparalleled by any other renewable energy source. Any body from a utility to an individual person can utilize a solar installation. While it is more expensive than any other source, it is increasingly becoming more competitive with dirty fuels.

Low-carbon, potential to provide jobs in NW, peak generation time more closely matches peak use time than wind.

sustainable

It is versatile, clean and quiet. I think residential solar looks better than wires. It can be used on large and small scales— we have seen it in villages quite different than Pdx. I think it is safe, but I am not know all the issues if it was used on a wider scale.

If done in areas that have already been impacted, like on roofs, then the environmental impact is minimal.

It’s plentiful, and solar hot water makes a lot of sense in a lot of different situations. I like solar hot water more than PV because there is less mining and other environmentally detrimental activities that go into a solar hot water system than go into a PV system (with current technology).

constant source

most abundant, and most eventual payback from research and development

I still think it will be a major player in our energy future.

It’s almost zero impact on the environment.


Renewable and we can use dead space on buildings for the panel farms.

It is renewable.

It is renewable. It is abundant. It is accessible; every roof and surface (including streets) that has adequate solar exposure can generate energy for space heating, water heating, and electricity production (including for transportation). Solar doesn’t kill birds (as opposed to wind) or fish (as opposed to hydro). Passive solar water heaters always have made sense in locations with adequate solar exposure. And while current PV technologies use toxic materials, they require a much smaller volume of those materials than do many other energy sources, particularly nuclear (don’t get me started!) and coal (ditto). I don’t believe solar is the only energy source we should use, but I do believe it should be a primary source. And of course, first and foremost, we MUST do everything we can to use less energy!

everyone can have it if it’s cost-compensated on existing buildings/houses and required in all new building.

sun is free

Solar power available to be tapped is huge compared to other potential sources. The challenge is to tap that energy through distributed solar to electric conversion.

No pollution, can store and harness energy, doesn’t interrupt landscape or cityscapes very much, low cost once installed.
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It's virtually infinite, completely renewable, the ultimate source of all energy (save nuclear) anyway, at peak production during peak usage, and can be distributed practically anywhere there are man-made structures with little or no environmental harm.

It feels good to use power that is given to us by the sun. The sun is shining anyway, might as well use it. There is no harm done by using sunlight.

Undefinite supply and the technology to make it affordable and efficient need extra attention to develop beyond the start up and luxury phase.

distributed generation, clean, and good for Oregon’s economy

Of all the sources listed, it may have the least impact in terms of extraction and the most likelihood of being consistently available. Hydro is clean in one sense, but degrades ecosystems. Wind seems too variable, kills birds, and alters landscapes (e.g., wind turbines on Steens Mtn.). Wave energy may have potential, but will likely turn out to have a significant eco-footprint. Geothermal seems pretty limited geographically, and poses landuse issues for thermal plants in natural areas, like Newberry Crater. Depending on how it's deployed, solar may also help decentralize distribution --which may turn out to be important for national security, given the grid’s vulnerability to cyber-warfare.

It appears to be the least invasive - coal, naturial gas, oil all have major negative impacts; I think the jury is out on wind (I worry about the noise, the unknown impacts on other species especially birds and bats); hydroelectric is not a bit favorite... so SOLAR! And I am a huge fan of public transit, passive solar and conservation.

Solar.. we have a climate like Germany. They have are one of the larger solar societies. We should too. I can’t wait for the costs on this to come down. I do think we ought to be looking at closer in collective solar installations rather than roof by roof. Our utilities should be installing them.

It diversifies the energy mix. i like it much more as distributed generation vs. large installations. if the building code for new structures mandated integration of solar, possibly with some incentives to overcome the construction industries objections, it could move solar into a more mainstream position and encourage development of non-obtrusive looking methods such as shingles and the films.

Available for free

It’s available, has few moving parts, no emissions; but probably can’t supply all my needs.

its


Because the sun comes up everyday and the energy is free if you set up the right system.

almost unlimited supply, but need to get costs down

It’s clean, once installed it doesn't produce any waste or emissions, it’s simple (as compared with wind), as a passive system. Most installations last 30 years or so.

renewable. and theres plenty of space to put it in city centers so theres less distance for the energy to travel.

The energy generated by the sun is endless. We need to capture it and use it. I’d like to see solar power used in every building, both residential and commercial.

Its renewable and nonpolluting. I believe the technology is available to "power" many more homes and buildings than we currently do. Countries, such as Germany, which have made a commitment to installing solar panels on their citizens’ roofs with such financial incentives that the installation and panels are mostly paid for by the incentives are having success with solar.

Right now, I wish it was less expensive. Solar power is clean, quiet, and non-invasive. I would put solar panels on my house and barn right now, if the cost was not so high. New construction should require solar usage. I think solar power will be the next big leap toward a fossil fuel-free existence. I also like wind power, but you asked for just one.

I would love solor on my home. The sun is always there, it won't harm other plants, animals, etc.

Probably the fewest environmental concerns of the major energy sources. However, it is not
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practical on an industrial level unless we start making it cheap enough for people to use on their homes.

same

There is no residue pollutants, it is a continuous resource and the cost is minimal.

It is green and clean.

Clean, readily harnessed, no known wildlife impacts.

Clean energy for the most part.

Constant free source of sunlight energy

Solar power is a constant source that is basically free and does not pollute the environment.

It doesn't harm anything, that I know of. If Germany can have solar panels on so many rooftops, why can't we? They don't get more sun than we do!

Available and good tax incentives currently

Cleaner, perhaps cheaper, and more independent (if panels are mounted on my roof).

Because it is clean. The problem is that its really expensive and it can't fully serve as baseload power. If it could, I'd prefer it over any other source.

I like the possibility of individual homeowners producing their own electricity.

We have lots of sun in eastern and central Oregon. No down side

Infinite supply for free!

though it is expensive, there are few downsides to it, i.e. no pollution, and only minor environmental impact.

Less chance for catastrophic failure (vs nuclear), does not require continued drilling/mining into habitat (vs natural gas, geothermal, coal), less chance to affect wildlife (vs hydroelectric, coal), can be used on a local scale. The technology has gotten better and better and recent projections have estimated that solar power will be competitively priced with other utilities in the next 3-5 years or so.

Solar panels can be placed on any man-made structure and assimilate energy directly into that infrastructure. If it was more readily affordable, homes and other buildings could be outfitted with their own solar panels and become self-sufficient. From what I know, there do not appear to be any negative environmental impacts from solar power.

All of our carbon-base fuel sources are basically stored energy from the sun. The sun will continue shining for billions of years and we are not depleting it by using more of its energy for our own energy needs.

It is something that the individual homeowner could use and is adaptable to many uses and the science has come a long way.

no pollutants during generation of power

It is abundant and free. Doesn't destroy natural capital to capture it. Takes money to invest in it, but savings would happen quickly if it were produced on a wider scale.

Relatively nonimpactful. Need to reduce impact of manufacturing however. It's the right place to invest effort though.

Renewable

It is passive, very simple and could require a much smaller footprint if mounted on existing buildings particularly commercial structures.

Free and easy—we need to make much more use of passive solar instead of emphasizing photovoltaics though.

It is there for everyone on earth. No need for resource wars.

Sun shines (sometimes behind clouds) everyday

It is clean, it can be located almost anywhere and is the best resource for distributed generation. Distributed solar minimized the need for new transmission. People can actively participate in the solution to climate change, rather than remaining passive. It contributes to local jobs, local energy financing, local energy ownership and recirculates dollars in Oregon's
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Such a huge potential and the original energy source!

Solar energy is the primary basis for all energy systems on Earth. Oregon should legislate that all new construction (homes included) install solar panels that reduces an buildings energy dependence by at least 50%.

It is free!!!!!! well, almost... there is a high upfront cost for the hardware, but it comes down w existing incentives

using the natural source of the sun

It's available with little impact on the environment.

renewable

It is a renewable source of energy that is easily obtained and more reliable than wind. But there are issues with the efficiency of the panels and the carbon emission from the manufacturing of those panels.

Can be installed virtually anywhere, completely clean, completely renewable, doesn't depend on large expensive facilities (like power plants or nuclear facilities) and therefore attractive for rural/poor areas

Renewable, low emissions (except for the production and installation of panels). Opportunity to create Oregon manufacturing jobs and retrofit building stock if we made massive investments. But I recognize all the downfalls with solar (e.g. intermittent generation, low amount of power compared to most needs). Also, the NW has incredible hydro resources, so our initial focus should be on transportation emissions rather than energy production.

Though I love our clouds and rain, we also have a lot of sun, particularly in eastern Oregon. There’s a lot of space where we could gather solar energy which does not have a negative impact on the environment or produce toxic waste.

Seems like a no-brainer. Everyone has a rooftop, so let's find a way to make it relatively inexpensive and easy to install.

In the right situation low emissions and a diffuse source rather than concentrated, high potential for small scale projects even at the homeowner level,

Because it's a clean, renewable energy resource.

renewable, less carbon emissions, could be used in a distributed manner, think about 'solar skins' for buildings

Can be both concentrated and distributed, so as to both feed into grids and allow for individual or small groups of buildings to be pretty self-sufficient. I am waiting with bated breath (along with a lot of other people) for breakthroughs in storage capacity). Small units can be very handy to power small scale energy needs here and there. Very versatile. Useful a part of a mix of power sources, hence the need for the smart grid.

Abundant, distributed, flexible -- potential for being cleanest if materials can be enhanced.

Captures natural energy - its like free fuel.

Because with 3rd generation Dye Sensitive Solar Cells, that can be printed at low cost on virtually any material, solar can become a ubiquitous source of energy.

Seems clean and feasible

plentiful supply. Growth can be measured in advancements of light capture and manufacturing efficiency

Its clean and using the largest and unlimited source of energy know to man. Doesn't have a bell curve. Available to all irrespective of national boundaries.

free and non-polluting

renewable resource, huge amount of energy available every day, and solar panels on roofs are reasonably attractive

It seems to be an infinite source and not owned by anyone who does not like us.

It is easily accessable. There is no danger to wildlife like in wind power where so many birds are being killed by the whirling blades. Solar is passive and could be wired into exiting electrical
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grids.
Its free and shines down on us everyday, no moving parts to the system so it has a long life with the exception of the inverter. Most importantly, it is our most abundant renewable energy resource worldwide.

There is more than we need in solar. The earth itself runs on solar power.
No emissions in generating, but there would be some in manufacture and installation. Fewer transmission problems if used on-site.

While solar capture involves energy expenditures, the power source is non-polluting
We live on a planet that is powered by the sun. Solar is our most logical power source.
This is truly the best option out there! Improvements need to be made on how to store it on 'off' hours, but the sun is a giant source of energy and is always available
Because it is natural and from God. And easy to maintain.

We recently installed 16 solar panels on our east Salem home. It is the least polluting or least damaging to to the environment. I am particularly concerned about the increase in wind power in the Columbia Gorge and eastern Oregon region because of the negative impact on birds and bats. We need to only locate wind farms below the crest of hills to reduce the fatalities of migrating raptors and birds and bats.

Highly renewable, few negative side-effects.
It can be generated anywhere, it’s renewable, solar panels look cool, it is clean and green.
I know this works well having grown up in Arizona. I actually went swimming in the early 1970’s at the home of Dr. Meinel who had converted his entire family residence to solar (quite innovative at that time). I had a solar heated in ground pool in Ontario Oregon in he 1990’s and I had a "passive/solar" greenhouse propagation" building constructed on my property in Fairbanks Alaska where I ran a successful PLANT CARE service for 10+ years.

It’s free and readily available all over the country. Wide use includes small and large applications which prevent monopolization by industry. Utilizing solar energy has no impacts on other species’ survival.
Clean.

Even though we have limited sun in Oregon, there is enough to power my exterior lights on the house and I live under alot of trees. We can use it.
It’s clean and renewable.
never ending - well for billions of years
See wind question

Can be done at the individual building level, doesn’t require a huge amount of infrastructure and environmental impacts like wind and LNG, it is truly "renewable" and sustainable less polluting
This, also is earth friendly.
Leverages a natural resource.
Proven science that is doable right now.
Existing technology, distributed power generation
not as ugly as wind power

It”s clean. If we only could use the EM waves from the sun in a way that is economically viable its something we should take advantage of.
Water heating is extremely efficient
It’s available on the east side and decentralized.
Same as wind, seems less invasive/destructive to the planet than some other options.
renewable
it is all over
renewable and clean
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Clean, renewable, doesn't interfere with nature (such as windmill blades with birds, or displacing sea creatures, or defacing the earth and polluting it with oil spills and uncaptured gas by-products, or damming rivers with all of its undesirable consequences). Solar energy is available to everyone everywhere. It just needs to be captured.

we get a lot of sun in central oregon

It works. I have a solar array on my house and love watching the meter run backwards on a sunny day. It can be added to the grid on almost any scale.

It's abundant, free, renewable. Every roof should be a solar roof, and we could decentralize the power grid.

clean

Sun shines 350 days a year

It is clean, renewable and harmonious with nature.

It's a 'free' and under utilized source of energy that can be readily collected and used for power.

Unlimited and renewable.

What's not to like? It's clean, it's portable and--with enough investment--photovoltaic cost-per-watt efficiency will soon surpass even coal's.

Readily available and proven to work.

Clean, lots of it

DAH! While photovoltaic are not quite cost effective yet...solar thermal is simply technologies that could be implemented now on large and small scale applications.

Cheap and no regulations. Anybody can set up some panels on their house.

Where appropriate, it provides power where none would be available otherwise.

It has least potential for affecting natural cycles.

It is clean, it is natural. Central Oregon promotes over 300 days of sunshine a year, so it is reasonable to say that it can provide enough. Although it is costly, laws of science prove that (especially if there are more people purchasing it) that the cost will decrease over time. It means that I can be self-supporting, and use no outside resource for my energy, unless really needed.

it is more efficient but costly

It is the cleanest

Area I live sun shines alot.

As our solar technology improves, solar can be very effective at reducing energy demand at a lower cost. This would be a great industry for Oregon to enter, since the US is lagging far behind China in solar technology. We have an opportunity to get a niche market if we go down this road as a state. California has Silicon Valley, Oregon can have the solar desert.

It's clean, doesn't cause any collateral damage that I know of (wind - birds flying into windmills, nuclear - danger of radioactive materials being release and their disposal issues), safe for the people who work with it, can be easily mounted on rooftops, no carbon emissions. its clean and quiet and we do seem to have a lot of sun most of the time (NOT this year!!).

Clean and locally generated.

Technology is coming along and it is relatively simple

The Sun is the most powerful agent in our system. It effects everything on Earth every day. Using this power for the betterment of mankind is an easy progression.

Clean

Solar as a supplement, where there is sufficient sunshine, is a good idea. The auxiliary equipment required besides just solar panels, is not cheap, and batteries must be replaced, but it could be a viable supplementary source.

It's renewable and it's clean, and there are many solar sites around, on commercial buildings as well as homes, and desert areas.
increasing efficiency of small scale solar; decreasing costs to users; public incentives--at least up to this year
Again, because it is available and it is not harmful to people.
we have lots of sun here. but only if it is done right. can we try to put solar panels on all the roofs? instead of developing and covering more undisturbed land?
Solar is actually the source of all energy types - except nuclear. It's clean, virtually unlimited, and we are getting more than we need - ie it's going to get trapped and warm the planet, so we might as well try to use some it for clean energy needs.
We might as well take advantage of the sun's energy as it comes to us regardless of what we do.
This is simply the cleanest energy source available
Cleanest
that's the ultimate solution and eventual
It is decentralized, but getting started with it is expensive for homeowners.
Can be done without impacting wildlife
I rather like the idea of being self sufficient. That said solar power is a technology which is far from being proven as economically viable. The market will decide.
inexpensive (long term), clean and will reduce our oil imports.
Clean
Doesn't have to be centralized in a location far away from energy consumers. Solar on every rooftop!
the sun is a huge source of energy. although the manufacturing process of panels/solar devices has an expensive LCA, we can diversify our energy through solar, and enable many areas to be off the grid, reducing cost of infrastructure.
It is the primary source of all energy (except nuclear). We should use it as a primary energy source, rather than letting nature turn it into vegetable and animal life, which, over the course of millenia, is changed into fossil fuel.
non polluting (except for manufacture of panels)..I have panels
It seems the easiest to acquire and has no possibility of negative impact to the environment.
No fossil fuel emissions (except production/maintenance), renewable/sustainable. The director of GE stated recently that it is estimated to be on par with the cost of conventional fossil fuels in 2-3 years, making it a much smarter investment than nuclear already. Little to no detrimental effects to the environment discovered yet.
free & unlimited
clean and renewable - can be implemented in small chunks
I like solar power when it is located on the building it is powering. I do not agree with the building of solar parks where they are destroying desert habitat and the power has to be transported a long way with giant transmission lines.
It seems to be the least polluting, is quiet, and I don't think it kills birds
It just makes sense
Doesn't take from resources or do damage
Works well as a source of supplemental, decentralized power.
no carbon
Clean, reliable and renewable
Solar power does not emit CO2 or other greenhouse gases. It’s quiet and does not cause bird kill (as wind power does) or ruin river systems (as hydro does). The question remains as to whether solar power infrastructure can be built to meet current usage needs.
It is already out there and seems to be fairly efficient, doesn't require big fans that are unattractive and kill birds, is not radio active, coal has too many issues, wave and geo thermal need to be persued but are still developmental.
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Same reason as wind; it's low impact and is not a finite resource.

Solar energy is the most plentiful energy source that we could possibly try to harness. We must be able to produce electricity efficiently from solar energy if we want to be sustainable. Solar technology still has a ways to go before it will be completely economically feasible, but I'm convinced that it is the wave of the future.

It's easy to put on top of existing structures.

I know we still have a ways to go to develop better storage capacity, but energy from the sun is free and not toxic. Other countries are way ahead of us with their manufacturing, sale and use of solar. That's ridiculous. Solar can also be used easily off the grid and doesn't have to be centralized or can be developed with large solar farms. Solar panels can be put wherever their is a concrete structure, commercial rooftops, parking lots, car roofs etc. Why can't government take the lead and install solar on all government facilities, highway byways, like used at I205-I5?? Solar for both water heating and electrical generation. We have some of the world's leading solar companies in Oregon, let's use them.

It's clean. It is noise-free. It doesn't conflict with nature, like wind does. It is readily available (in some places) and can be distributed through a smart, improved grid.

The sun is an abundant energy source.

Renewable and the costs are rapidly lowering. It allows each person to make a difference unilaterally.

It's free.

Harnesses an unlimited source that doesn't take away from it.

I believe that energy production should be decentralized. Solar is the best way to do that. Every building and home could produce all the energy required on site. When tied into the grid, individual solar systems are very efficient.

It seems to have the least impact on ecology as a whole.

There is little waste from the production of energy other than the mining for the silica. We need to move towards the bent solar types to minimize the silica mining impacts.

Renewable, could be local to need for power, such as panels located on your house or nearby reducing the need for transmission, does not harm birds and other flying creatures such as wind turbines, does not add to carbon load after production of panels, proven technology, ... natural creates jobs building panels.

It is clean and we won't run out of it.

It is free. If we all had solar collecting roof tiles (already exist) we would need less powerlines, have a much smaller utility bill from existing (hydropower) to back us up. As long as the tiles are constructed in an earth friendly manner there would be very few negative side effects as there are with wind, coal and even hydro. In a world bathed in sunlight it seems like the best way to collect energy.

No damage to wildlife.

There is enough of it to power everything we really NEED to do.

Again, minus the materials used in creating the solar cells, it seems to be a rather pure way to capture energy.

It worked for millennia before we started building stuff.

We have enough sun in most of the state to make it worthwhile.

Efficient and quiet.

All energy is solar energy in essence, capturing it nearest to it's source seems efficient.

Feeds the electric grid without releasing additional carbon.

Unlike sewage and wave power, Solar power would probably be more feasible in eastern Oregon, and they could use the Jobs.

Seems to be "clean" and it can be installed in lots of different places...

It's available and technology is feasible, though some constituents less available.

Probably the least cost and the least polluting.
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It’s non-threatening to all.
It is the original, natural power source for all life on Earth. It only makes sense for us to go back to the source. But we do need more efficient panels, since we can’t cover the Earth with them - that would impact agriculture and other planted areas. I also like wind and wave where possible, but acknowledge that they shouldn’t be everywhere - it could blight the planet.
It’s simply there to use, without damage to the universe or to the planet.
Has the potential to be least impactful on the environment.
It can heat water or be converted into electricity, it’s shining on most of us everyday except near the poles. It doesn’t directly harm animal habitats, though there is some pollution from manufacturing of solar panels of course. It’s quiet! I’m sure there’s more.
It lets me contribute even when I am not home and am not using power. It decentralizes power. We can all help be the solution.
It can be employed on both small, medium and large scales.
The opportunity to put solar on each home should be mandated. if every home in America got 25-30% of the electricity from solar there wouldn’t be an energy problem. But there is to much corporate money to stop that
it’s renewable and dependable
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**72 Why do you like geo-thermal power?**

Because the furnaces are available. If I were building a new house I would put it in. non polluting. Renewable?
A naturally occuring source of energy; no carbon footprint.
We have the sources in Mt. Hood. It is clean and plentiful.
renewable and plenty of it
i think that it is largely an untapped system. we should be careful not to pollute aquifers but the fear of cooling down or heating up the earth’s crust seems much less of an environmental factor than the impact fossil fuels are having on the atmosphere and the impact that has on heating up the earth

Because it’s both renewable and can be extremely local
Breitenbush is a good example, and we visited there recently. It’s a great way to get energy, if it’s available.
Steady supply of potential. No seasonal variations, not affected by weather. Infinitely renewable resource. Some locations are better than others, but it’s a heat source that is available anywhere in the world, just by drilling deep enough.
Geo-thermal power has a minimal impact on the location at which it is located. Like hydroelectric power, geo-thermal has the ability to produce consistent electricity production. It is also using a natural earth system which does not run out in order to generate electricity.
Harness an existing resource to reduce carbon emissions.
unsure
Not as cheep as I might like right now but has the potential. Clean and efficient.
No one system of energy will meet all needs, but I think tapping in to this to boost traditional heating and cooling would help with pollution and cut gas and electric usage. I am not too familiar with it, so there are probably downsides I don't understand.
It is readily available and clean energy
I've lived with. I've worked with it. I have the software and knowledge to use it.
if it exists, it is close to carbon neutral and naturally very powerful
Like solar, where it is available, it’s use places almost no burden on the environment.
There are Volcanoes here we should use the off shoots of their being here.
It is renewable.
Low environmental impact.
fewer side effects and more renewable than alternatives
it already exists i' have some concerns about how it's use would affect water tables and would need to become more educated on the topic
I've seen it used effectively in other parts of the world
I think that it is one of the less intrusive sources
I don't know that much about it, but it seems like a very plentiful supply of heat. Iceland runs mostly on geo-
thermal I believe.
Cost-effective and sustainable.
Don't really know.
Another non polluting source of energy.
It is a constant source of heat and isn't affected by weather.
There is an enormous amount of energy stored in the hot interior of the Earth. Wherever it is feasible to use it as an energy source we should do so. It, too, is basically carbon-free.
It is a relatively passive source of power that could be done with little impact if done right. Is also something that could be scaled to the individual homeowner.
no pollutants
Abundant and natural source. As long as we aren't drilling too deeply to access it as a source.
Lowest impact.
Renewable
It is passive simple and consistent in delivery.
Low impact, presumably limitless.
it doesn't pollute as much as other sources, it is free and we have a hot core in the middle of the planet using the warmth of the water below the soil - again a natural source
Clean, renewable, simple, not weather-dependent (and thus less variable in output than solar or wind)
Don't know that much about it, but it seems like a fairly environmentally benign technology if sited appropriately. Because it's a renewable energy resource.
renewable, less carbon emissions
Potentially low impact, very steady (24 hrs/day, 365 days/year); at present lots of availability in the western US, and potentially (probably pending some different kinds of fracking technology) available pretty much anywhere. Would love to know more about the experimental development at Newberry.
Again its natural energy - an untapped resource. I'd like to see more trial methods to capture this energy for commercial use in large facilities.
I don't know much about it, but have heard of some usage in Medford that seems successful.
It is a local source and has little impact on the envionment
renewable resource, always available, very efficient
It's cool and fun to say. Also, no emissions except what the earth belches out.
It again is natural and if someone wants to use there natural hot water to heat or create energy let them do it.
May places much colder then here, like Iceland, have used geo-thermal energy for decades, perhaps even longer. There's a hot spring not too far from here that's not being used except as a tourist attraction and the water just flows into the river. Steam has been around and is a proven source of energy production without the polution.
It's free and clean
Warm water flowing through pipes in the floor of your home -“radiant floor heating” is efficient and comfortable.
Heat rises naturally so - as I experienced first hand in Alaska where I owned a 5* energy rated 2300 sq.ft. home - natural hot water like from a hot springs just makes sense. Iceland has been doing this for some time and where applicable, we should also. It is renewable.
Do not know enough about it but talked with a homeowner who had it and it sounds simple and effective
It's clean and renewable.
it's there waiting to be used
Ditto - but it will be more likely to fall into the hands of the greedy as has our other resources. In fact, we already have enough power to recreate a livable planet if it weren't for greed-ridden entities squandering and destroying the current resources.

Again I only like it if it is near the cost of hydroelectric
less polluting
We have been told there is geo thermal sources in our Cascade Mountain Ranges. It would be great to find a cost effective method to use geo thermal.
Oregon has plenty of potential for it if the regulations would allow its development.
cheap, abundant, efficient
taps into select source that continues to reproduce
minimal environmental impact and a resource we have right here in America.
When available, once installed the source is cheap to operate
It's inexpensive and reliable.
It is a constant source of energy, but not sure if it is cost effective.
The Earth produces it .. magma, water, heat, steam... dahhhh
It sounds promising. It runs 24/7, unlike wind/solar which require backup.
Go talk to Oregon Technical Institute's Geo-thermal center.
Simple, low tech, can be constructed on a variety of scales and easily incorporated into the power grid. Unlike solar or wind it can run 24/7.
great way to harness earths energy
clean
That's part of the I dont know answer - what the heck is geo thermal power?
very low impact
It is a no brainer for the northwest. The earth is warm when you drill down far enough. It also has low impact.
Where available, it provides power with little impact.
tap what's there
seems like a good idea
It is a natural heat source.
obviously there is an abundance of it
smart if done cleanly
In Oregon we have geothermal sources that could provide a lot of energy if developed
It's clean and renewable, and can be tapped with heat pump technology.
cheap power -- except in Oregon where installation costs are high
Because it is available.
Same.
taps into ground-source based energy derived from earth's own geophysics and depending on area (eg Iceland) can replace indivudual household and industrial hot water tanks, one of the largest consumers of electricity in a home.
This is something new to me, but it makes perfect sense. The earth is a ball of fire and I believe would be a great source of energy.
There are lots of opportunities for geo-thermal here in Oregon.
Mixed bag for me on this. Seems like a consistent source of power. Am a bit uneasy about environmental consequences.
Renewable/sustainable. Use your own geography/geology to your advantage! Plus, I think we need more research in this field in general. We still know very little about earthquakes and seismology.
free
uses free heat.
it is relatively non-invasive, unless you are talking about the deep level geothermal that is similar to fracking, that
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i do not support.
Same
Where available it is a great source of power.
It's the least polluting and it would be accessible everywhere.
I don't know as much about this but I basically like it because it's a renewable resource. I'd like to learn more about the comparative benefits and draw backs but I haven't learned much.
Of the power sources this is the enviromentally cleanest available in Oregon, and the last to be implemented. There are 5+ power plants that are being proposed to start up in the next few years per DEQ. There has been a definate rise in the number of applications for both district heating (e.g. OIT campus in klamath Falls) as well as for local use with heat pumps per WRD and DEQ.
I beleive Oregon's position over a subduction zone offers greater potential for low cost heat than we now use - from Mt. Hood to Klamath Falls - and to isolated hot springs in eastern Oregon. It is under us now, has low caarbon contribution, and little waste by-products. seems to harness a source of energy that is already there without effecting it in a bad way
It appears that tapping geo-thermal would have little ecological effect as well.
little damage to wildlife
I don't know exactly. I guess it just sounds like it makes the most sense for heating/cooling a building instead of just plopping a structure on the earth and sourcing energy from all around...why not integrate? It is used in many countries and it appears to be a renewable source. It will never use up all of the earths heat. I simply want another option if its available in oregon
I like the idea of using what is already in place & it seems to be clean...
Available
It's a natural resource. It doesn't have to be extracted destroying land and other resources.
it's renewable, and where available, it's dependable
n = 113

**74 Why do you like methane power?**

It is a naturally occuring by-product of plant and animal "wastes" - but this should not be construed to condone large digesters to collect forestry debris and brush from distant sites and trucking them to a central facility. That would be ludicrous.

Reuses a waste and turns it into an asset.
Naturally occuring, somewhat "renewable" gas.
Because it captures an emission and puts it to use. Free and plenty of it.
waste becomes a resource
clean, renewable, using waste
If it's associated with waste, it's a good way to reclaim the energy that will go into the atmosphere.
Reduces waste by harnessing an existing resource and keeping it from acting as an even more potent greenhouse gas than CO2.
Methane from garbage is a bi product which, if not used, escapes in to the atmosphere. Why not make it productive?
reuse of solid waste makes sense (if already in waste, might as well reuse it before finally disposing of)
It's source is continually being renewed.
Methane is a by product of animal and human waste so by incouraging it's use you would get all citizens of Oregon in on the power.
It is renewable.
It's already available, in masse, and helps our waste management as well.
it is a renewable
It is renewable and seems to be less resource intensive and as far as I know does not involve hazardous materials, like solar, and does not result in big ugly farms, like wind.
I think it is a good idea to try to use the methane that is there ... why not?
It is a good way to increase the benefits from something considered a waste product
Created from waste
our trash and excessive livestock creates it, might as well harness it.
it's available and would otherwise escape into the atmosphere
Methane is being created all the time, and it makes sense to use it rather than waste it.
Using what is considered worthless wastes.
It is utilizing a source of power that is recycling garbage.
All else equal, it may be the most benign of the lot.
Use waste for power
It is there, why not use it
because it is a by-product of waste management and farming (dairy, pig farms) which now is being lost and it contributes to polution
Using waste gas for energy makes more sense that burning it off into the atmosphere.
Use an existing source now wasted and ignored
Because it's a renewable energy resource.
Uses a source of energy which currently adds methane to the atmosphere, thus benefiting us both by decreasing a pollutant and by increasing available energy for use. If the vast majority of livestock a AND human waste could be used to generate energy it would be a triple plus, as it would reduce pollution, create another distributed power source, and allow the residue to be used for clean compost for growing foods locally (increasingly desirable with peak oil.)
Capture an unused resource.
Its naturally obtained without blowing anything up.
It uses our waste for a good purpose.
It makes sense to glean energy from a waste material.
You have to understand, I live in a rural area. There are three feedlots within five miles of my place. They sell their waste back to the farmers for fertilizer, but suppose it could be used to power our small town's electric needs too. It is a resource that's just keeps coming day after day. The science is already known and the results are proven.
I don't know much about it. I saw a piece on television. I think it is good to use up the waste we produce. I believe the article said it is expensive to set up, so it would not be my first choice in this economic time of crisis, but sometime in the near future it might be worth exploring. Doesn't Marion County have a waste burning facility-- how is it working?
go to waste if not used
It's an efficient and logical use of waste by-products. We will always produce methane. Capturing and utilizing methane has no impacts on other species' survival.
We produce a LOT of methane so if it's possible to capture and utilize it for energy then great! I really don't know much about it though.
it's a resource waiting to be used
I like it only if cost is near hydroelectric
available, cheap
Burn methane to generate power
There is alot of it available in our land fills, sewer systems and at natural gas sites. I hope a cheap and durable method is capable of holding up under the costic enviroment the generator operates in.
It makes good use of waste. It could be done locally/on-site.
It's easy to produce, it's a natural by-product and the source is readily available. In fact I can produce it myself using my horse manure.
a good use of garbage, reduces land fills - should be cheap to generate makes use of a byproduct, clean burning.
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Cost of goods is low
I enjoy the idea of harnessing energy from waste.
It is readily available
We have an abundance of garbage it's a good way of making it useful. Did you know a guy in Japan has developed a way of turning plastic back into oil? Absolutely brilliant!
Soft path approach (remember Amory Lovens?? sp.). It can be produced in a variety of places at almost any scale and fed into the system.
It uses a gas that is being created by the sewage already farts for free
It is naturally occuring so why not capture, cultivate and use it?
Seems like a good idea
Using methane is essentially recycling, which is a cornerstone of any effort to reduce the carbon footprint.
It is a good use of what use to be a useless by product uses our waste
Productive use of waste material
cheap power -- the gas gets burned off anyway
I don’t know if I like it, per say. But there has to be a lot of it available.
Methane is produced anyway so it might as well be used as a power source if possible.
It seems to have potential
Makes good use of waste, might be somewhat more reliable than wind and solar reduces GHG emissions from waste, and we keep generating more waste (cattle, human, humus/compost etc.).
It’s smart recycling. It uses our own waste for fuel and simultaneously captures one of the worst greenhouse gases before it can be released into the atmosphere. What’s not to like?
it is free, being a by-product of the sewage process makes use of waste
It’s preferable to coal & oil because there are fewer toxic byproducts. It may also be something that can be generated by bio-process. BUT -- it will still result in CO2 emission when burned. So I’m ambivalent.
Because it’s a creative way of reducing the negative effects of methane while producing energy. Landfill gases are already producing methane but capturing methane to burn and create a net positive impact (because methane is 23 times more harmful of a greenhouse gas than co2) is a smart way of turning something bad into something good. Plus, we have landfills already. This solution doesn’t require us to create new structures where there were none. We don’t have to use resources to build a wind farm on another horizon. We can also decentralize the locations of the resources - these can be in every community and therefore not competing for the transmission (ie. BPA having to monitor wind vs. hydro). Finally, it is not reliant on the sun or the wind. Biomass can work all day and night (when the sun’s not shining) and in any weather - it’s more predictable.
seems simple
Oregon’s population will surely grow. There will be more sewage as a result. Why not put it to good use? Poo, like wind is something we will never run out of

77 Why do you favor an incentives-based approach to climate change?
nothing would be best, but incentives are better than regulation
Encouraging what you want to see in the world is a much more positive way to effect change on society, rather than telling people what they can and cannot do.
I don’t like the idea of Government forcing people to do things because it is a fascist way but mostly because it hurts business and the common family for "following the rules"
People do sometimes dangerous things with enforcement-based methods, which can be perceived as aggressive and punitive. A system based on cooperation is a better way to go.
Not everyone can afford a new hybrid car or alternate power source. It seems that affordable alternates aren’t always out there and people need to be encouraged to make a change, not punished if they can’t.
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Those who benefit from the incentives probably worked harder and earned it...they deserve the reward. Those who fail to benefit are probably those who failed to act responsibly, so they are getting their just rewards also. Minimizes accusations of government over regulating.

Because regulations will be written with loopholes. Better to encourage better behavior.

Because all great achievements have come from incentive, not force!

Tax cuts and grants to those people of groups who are willing to build use renewable power.

We need a system that works with honey not a stick

Incentives helps lead to efficient

Eny government involvement can have unintended consequences, but regulatory methods seem to be more arbitrary, less flexible, and unlikely to change. Incentive-based methods may be easier to adjust and fine tune as experience emerges from their use.

I think we need to have incentives to insulate our homes. Not just 300 dollars but some real money. One idea is the roof/ attic~ seal and insulate that and remove knob and tub. Provide a large incentive for that. The argument against this is removing the knob and tub does not save energy. Argument for is doing nothing does nothing to save energy

Reward change rather than mandate

Because real change will only happen when more energy efficient (less emitting) options are the cost effective options.

incentives work best with people, other wsie you get push back non compliance

More positive approach, puts resources into creating alternatives rather than punishment (not that I’m totally against regulation). If resources were moved from outdated incentives for declining, polluting industries (oil) and invested into new, clean technology, we could make real change.

it will get people to change

Because it’s a less invasive approach to an issue that I don’t care that much about.

not a fan of regulations i’m unconvinced of the need in the first place, at least at a state level, so incentives are less intrusive than other governmental actions

It will make it easier for people to purchase the technology and they can choose whether or not to install it. Whereas regulations spread the cost over everyone, you can’t really pick & choose. I definitely feel there is a place for regulation such as Oregon’s RPS. A statewide miles per gallon mandate would be helpful.

People respond better to incentives. Give us something to strive for.

If there is regulation it should be incentive based to let people do what they want to. I really don’t think there should be any regulations on climate change.

I believe it will be more effective, in that more people will implement changes that are effectively reinforced.

I hesitated to say incentives-based because in general I think the government needs to do much much less of everything. But I like to reward good behavior (incentives) much more than punish bad (regulations, taxes, etc.) I think that if new technologies are truly worthwhile then we shouldn’t need to provide incentives to adopt them.

that way i might be able to pay more taxes

I only favor it if it does not cost the taxpayers a ton of money

We are micro-managed enough as it is. Keep teh Fed.govt. out of it and let the States develope what is best for them. Each State has it’s own unique weather.

because people respond to incentives.

MANY MANY reasons first being that this is not the governments business. Regulations are bad for economy. Bottom line is that it should be dealt with in the private sector of free will and free market.

Industry will always migrate to the obvious cost savings

Incentives do less damage than regulations. I’ve seen too many poorly conceived regulations, like the MTBE debacle in CA. Or requiring ethanol in gasoline. Such a waste of effort and money. This hurts the economy. Plus, incentives is how the free market works. People will do what is in their best interest. They hate being forced and will even work against it. Capitalism can be a strong force when used effectively. CO2 and carbon taxes are meaningless to people. Switching to clean electricity from foreign oil or coal is easy to understand. Incentivize them to do that, the carbon emissions drop automatically. The easy way works better.

regulation kills jobs
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Regulations just create more bureaucracy, stifle development, and take away our freedoms. Incentives are better but we should not give taxpayer money to people for energy projects that are not fiscally profitable.

More effective in the long run

Too many regulations as is. Always a way around regulations. Carrot better than a stick.

Too many rules and regulations already in effect

Economy

Punishing or fining people who are not ready to change is not the answer. There was a study done with monkeys that showed that after the 99th monkey started doing an encouraged activity, all others followed. We don't have the magic number for humans, but when it is the norm, more will follow. Incentives, or rather programs that make it easy, or more affordable are what gives everyone the freedom to choose, but still make a difference.

I believe there is more quality buy in when people are not forced to do something by the government.

It allows for people to have a decision on the financial and lifestyle impact rather than having it shoved down our throats.

It promotes individualism and maintains our freedom to make our own choices.

It will promote both commercial and consumer options

People are not stupid. No one wants to live in a climate of toxins. If given the incentive to put solar panels on my roof (lowering my taxes) I would gladly do it. We are being taxed to death, and even after death, taxed on money previously taxed. It's infuriating to hear politicians talk about newer and better ways to confiscate more of our money, and the "green" movement is an example.

I value my freedoms, and I generally opposed the government setting "Regulations" or "increasing taxes." I realize that these have there place. However, I would prefer them to be used rarely, and (when used) I would like it to be efficient and concise. Also, although I am concerned about our environment and would like for us to be better stewards of our natural resources, I would not this as a priority over jobs or safety.

It is the private industries that will respond efficiently, not the government. The government does NOTHING efficiently, only adds costs, so more regulation, more regulators, more people on the public dole. Private industries can create more jobs.

Oregonians are already over regulated, and new regulations open the door for the environmental community to impede use of natural resources without science based facts

More likely to be effective

It rewards good behavior

This keeps the social engineering to a minimum and would not result in another round of overly restrictive regulations penned in Salem, by Salem, for Salem.

It's more likely to be successful

Positive inducement is good.

Because of regulatory capture/political corruption by large corporations, laws and regulations are not written or enforced to protect the people or the planet. I believe that each individual will do the right thing if given the opportunity and/or a choice that is economically attainable.

Seems a pragmatic response.

People will respond to that more than others.

Encourage companies to move forward

Let the people and the markets along with help/incentives become a driving force to get this market out in the open and working. We do have to change so let's help it happen.

If you give people more dollars to move to renewable energy more people would do it.

\[ n = 58 \]

Why do you favor a regulations-based approach to climate change?

The state budget (or national) can't afford additional incentives for something that should be a requirement and should have been dealt with in the past. Utilities and industry have been fitting
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regulation for years and know that it’s coming eventually - we must set stronger standards and regulate them effectively.

Because as I’ve observed from watching people and corporations most people and corporations won’t do what is necessary or right but must be forced to comply to protect the future of humanity.

Because it has become abundantly clear that we do not have time for incentives to work. The science makes clear that our window to avoid tipping points to catastrophic climate change is closing rapidly.

I do not believe that people will change their behaviors and adjust to the levels required to avoid serious climate consequences unless they are forced to. I do not think they will voluntarily make these changes.

It’s simple, straightforward, and applies to all similarly situated people and organizations.

Because I’ve found that many people (including corporations) will do things only if they’re required to do so. I realize that the creation and enforcement of climate change regulations face profound and powerful opposition in this country. But I also know that many other countries are moving quickly and effectively to reduce their per-capita energy consumption, convert to renewable energy sources (particularly Japan, Germany, and South Korea, which have declared their commitment to solar), require companies to be responsible for their products from cradle to cradle, and implement much stiffer GHG emissions standards. I’d like the US to get on board.

I’m seeing individuals, neighborhoods, cities, states, and corporations take the lead, even if the federal government won’t yet.

Because I think most people and businesses are more concerned with money than with doing what’s right. It seems like they will do everything to get around having to pay out for improvements and upgrades unless they are threatened with huge fines. Example- people didn’t start buying hybrid cars in large numbers until gas prices went up. Car companies aren’t going to make really fuel efficient vehicles until mileage efficiencies are enforced.

The state has a robust incentive program already. Utilities should be required to cut carbon emissions and provide the means for customers to reduce energy use.

People will avoid a fees or fines. The incentives dole out tax credits which are too great a cost for governments.

I’ve learned in psychology classes, people respond better to punishment than reward. Although the idea of an incentive is lovely, most people will opt to just ‘skip it’. However, if there is punishment involved (such as fines) people will go out of their way to avoid it. Want something done? Hit people in the pocketbook.

30 years ago a mix of incentives and regulation would have been productive. We’ve waited too long to depend on incentives. What greater “public good” could be invested in than a human-friendly climate? None. See any rush to invest? We’re well beyond incentives.

Why make a deal with the devil. Some save, some trade? NO everyone should cut down. Just because you can afford to pay for it, you use it?

Why should corporations be rewarded for what they should already be doing. They receive enough incentives through tax cuts and loopholes. It needs to be regulated because it’s necessary to our quality of life and the existence of future generations. No-brainer if you ask me. No need for incentives.

I am outraged that the wind energy system was gamed by industry and the state has allowed it to happen when they broke individual projects into ever smaller projects to get the maximum tax benefits. dumb My only concern is that powerful energy generation entities can also game the regulatory mandates put forward by the state. sad

gov track record beyond bad with incentives, creating huge price to pay for the rest of us for policy probably worse than doing nothing

It is the most straightforward.

I believe climate change poses such a threat that much more than lip service is required to correct the problem. As I said earlier, this is our only earth, so zero tolerance is our only solution. Also, if Oregon hasn’t joined the other 15 states that has joined California’s law suit against the federal government to reduce car emissions, we should do so.
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Because people in general don’t make big changes unless they have to. You just have to make them. Waiting for attitudes to change will prove deadly. Take the recycling of plastic bags as an example.

We are all affected by poor choices and practices of others. Climate change should be all of us doing everything we can to improve our chances for lowering the impact of our living.

Why do you favor a mix of incentives and regulations incentives when it comes to climate change?

We need all the motivation we can get to change our ways. We can’t change fast enough.

Some regulation needed or no response incentives will stimulate creativity

Different companies have different motivations. It’s good to cover all the bases.

It rewards those who deserve it and those who don’t.

Incentives are better but they are not always affordable or economically viable.

Taking the middle road is usually the most effective. There will also be less political backlash this way.

Because I would like to see fewer regulations but believe the reality is that we will have to have some.

Many people know the perils we face but don’t have the means to pay for state-of-science insulation for their homes, or to install passive solar, or any other capital investment. Corporations are primarily (exclusively?) concerned with short-term profits. Public and private sectors need to be prodded and rewarded for making positive changes.

Some things will just never change without regulations; that said, it would be nice to be as flexible as possible with industries, etc. who find this wholesale change extremely threatening and/or cost prohibitive -- change is very difficult, and the more you can get folks to make that decision on their own, the better.

Because incentives alone aren’t enough and regulations alone would be resented.

I think regulations should set a new bar, a minimum threshold for carbon-related activities, and that should be coupled with incentives to encourage greater reductions above the minimums. Incentives could also be geared towards low-income households, small businesses, and others who need extra help to make carbon reductions affordable.

Some people will go for the incentives, but they have to be educated about what they are first. Some people can’t afford even incentives (PV panels or a new car, for example) as much as they care and want to (me).

Some people just don’t care or are misinformed, and regulations are the only way to enforce the social contract of the commons.

Some issues allow for people to make choices (preferably good choices). Other issues are more pressing and require action now and people to fall in line.

Incentives can work well, but they don’t work for everyone. There has to be at least some baseline standard which everyone has to meet, and incentives to make people go beyond that baseline. For example, a 50% emissions cut for all utilities, with tax breaks and other incentives if they exceed that target.

Some people respond better to incentives and others to regulations. Regulations can help us set a societal default for actions and incentives can help encourage people to go beyond the default.

It is unreasonable to expect new tech to develop without regulations, a bottom line standard. Historically, the US has used regulation to implement an explicit energy policy, while incentives and subsidies provided implicit supports. It was effective for creating a national electric grid, and it would be reasonable to expect such strategies to be effective now. The major obstacles are the projected "losers" ie the big energy stakeholders. However, we will all be losers (including the much less culpable developing nations of the world) if we continue current trends in energy production and consumption.

Neither works well alone and neither is enough alone.

Because it will create more of a result and deal with both sides of the problem: the people and big time corporations.

Regulations are opposed by many and often costly to provide good oversight of regulations. Mixing regulations with incentives may reduce opposition to regulations.

Positive and negative reinforcement generate change more quickly than any one approach.

Because we have seen that a combination is the most effective way to enact change. Regulation is only
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about punishment and inspires people to find loopholes. Incentives can inspire innovation, but there needs to be parameters for people to work within and expectations that need to be baseline.

people need incentives to afford change, regulation is necessary for entities unwilling to make change because we need to do something fast! it takes time for change, the industry, and regulation to happen. we are already too late to stop climate change, we can only mitigate some of the damage. when our leadership doesn't wholly endorse climate change how can we expect citizens to endorse it.

incentives help drive the front of the market or early adopters forward - further and faster regulations bring up the mass market both are needed to successfully move the entire market

Regulations must be used to reach a certain level of carbon reduction. Incentives should be used to encourage people/businesses to go beyond mandated standards.

There are benefits to both. People like to be rewarded with incentives, and this will cause further changing in people's actions. If people are rewarded for their good behavior, or in this case, being more "green," they will continue to change their behavior. If people are forced to change, they will be more resistant to it.

However, regulations will pressure people to change if they are completely ignoring change, and have high carbon emissions.

From what I read about recent scientific findings, climate change is growing more alarming by the year. It's already too late to avoid some significant suffering and our political will is failing us, so I think we need to try everything. I know it's more popular and easier to go strictly with incentives, but regulations definitely have their place.

Incentivize the good things and tax the bad things on society.

Because EVERYONE prefers a positive carrot at the end of a stick, but some don't act until they have to.

The mix of incentives and regulations accomplishes what the other cannot. You need both to reach the goal.

Personally, if I didn't have both incentives, and regulations (or consequences) in my life, I would not accomplish my own goals.

Since there are some things that are more important and should be regulated, while there are certain things that the people should get to choose if they want to contribute.

It should be hit with every available option, from every possible direction.

Not everyone believes in climate change. Change in how we produce energy is imperative, yet beating people over the head will not win hearts and minds. Also, there are people that believe in climate change, yet don't have the privilege or luxury of changing their actions or habits (Lower income). For these two groups creating incentives that will generate a single bottom or double bottom line benefit (economic prosperity and equity/social justice) is a good first step. As a result of meeting their single or double bottom line these people, with time, may engage in the missing environmental stewardship action that would benefit all. Regulation can help protect the third leg in the stool (environmental stewardship), while signaling to the public that slowing down the effects climate change is a priority. It can also be used to signal to industry and consumers that we are in a transition period where if creative market driven action does not raise the bar for creative innovation to meet our environmental, economic and social goals, than more regulation will be soon to come. Selling regulation as a way to build industry, protect, jobs and protect our natural spaces for all in our region, versus preaching about gloom and doom is a much more sustainable campaign.

Regulations are ideal in forcing people to modify their practices. However, as a political caveat, there needs to be incentives in order to quell the backlash that comes with forcing people to change their behavior.

Incentives alone aren't enough - we can't afford to incentivise to make costs of adoption favorable.

Regulation is required to address the market externalities (the unincorporated costs of fossil-fuel based power generation).

change is always slow

Incentives provide the nudge to make me act, and can make things affordable to a wider population. We might not have been able to afford out solar package with out the incentives, or would have had to skip the Prius for a while. and it is a good return on my tax dollars in the sense that it improves my community and world. But, we all need a push and this is an issue that relates to quality of life for the world as a whole. The US lifestyle is a major factor in global warming and we are not moving fast enough on our own, incentives or no, so more regs are needed unfortunately. In a perfect world, I hope that the folks making those regs know more than me about what should come first, what would make a difference etc. But it isn't a perfect world, so moral, ethical, science based regulations, not just any regulations are what I would endorse.
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B/C incentives help those who are already motivated to take action, and regulations get those who are not motivated to take action.

Carbon tax is an appropriate incentive and a revenue source

I think there is potential for abuse when using either incentives or regulations. Powerful corporations have a way of finding a way around most any law. But I think that by using both methods, we could find what generates the most success and is the most effective way not only to reduce our emissions but also to help encourage a greener mindset of the general population.

It’s always good to lead with incentives, and get people to see the opportunity in building a more resilient society that is not dependent on damaging the environment in order to exist. However, there will always be people that refuse to see this opportunity, and they sometimes are in positions of influence. If they don’t do anything, the incentives will be cancelled out by their refusal to be proactive. Therefore the regulations need to be in place to get them to change their behavior.

There have to be certain regulatory baselines in order for people to comply; within that framework, incentives can help drive development without leaving things entirely to the free market regulations to link true results to your activities instead of pushing off your costs to someone else or the future, and incentives to send consistent price signals for development projects.

It seems that neither approach alone is sufficient.

Two sides of one coin...

More likely to work than either alone.

I am more in favor of regulations but I think doing both is the most likely way to realize change quickly.

Incentives to get home owners and businesses to solarize. Regulate all new buildings and industry.

The carrot and the stick haven’t worked separately as of yet. maybe the combination could.

Get it from both sides, offering incentives for change, and financial liability for noncooperation, which would help fund further projects.

Incentives will be more easily accepted by the public and industry. It’s the carrot. Regulations do work but will be resisted. Nobody likes the stick on their backs.

Incentives motivate individuals and new business, but CHANGE is hard for industries unless forced by regulation.

Makes it harder to avoid changing

The issue is too critical to rely on any one approach. the problem is system-wide, involving government, industry and the consumer public, and the solution needs also to be systemic.

Forcing change raises many peoples hackles and they dig in their heels not forcing change creates apathy incentive and education (including visuals that could create guilt about what we are doing to earth) will reach empathetic people.

I think we need stronger regulations to move industry and innovation more quickly. When Portland mandated all new city buildings had to be LEED certified, the green building knowledge in the city expanded rapidly to meet those guidelines. We have to find ways to change industry and individual’s behaviors - ideally in ways they don’t have to go out of there way to implement. Perfect example: dual flush toilets are now at the airport, convention center, etc. (which is great) - but people have to change their behavior to use less water. The less water flush should have been matched with current behavior, otherwise there’s very little improvement.

Because we have to move quickly to cause as much change as possible.

Not all change comes from rules nor from incenting people and businesses. A mixed approach reaches more of a variety of people and business and a variety of motivations.

We need to be aggressive and act quickly. I would also favor programs that negotiate and buy down the costs of solar energy with mass production.

I think we have to do everything we can. We have to use incentives to encourage the leading edge and regulation to move along the middle and stragglers.

Incentives alone won’t be sufficiently motivating. Regulation alone won’t be sufficiently politic.

Because incentives appeal to one group of folks, and for those who aren’t interested in doing good either as altruism / enlightened self-interest or because it makes business sense, there needs to be a mechanism to
require a baseline responsibility. NO LOOPHOLES!
it provides a carrot and stick approach
no one strategy will work on its own
People need encouragement in the way of incentives as well as enforcement of regulations, without which, very little would be accomplished. Psychologically, rewards and punishments work in tandem to produce the greatest results. However, we need to frame the regulations as opportunities to maximize progress so that people don't balk at something they consider punitive.
We can try both approaches and observe the results. Realistically, the problem is global. Multinational corporations need to be brought on board, as do other national governments. There is nothing wrong with doing the right thing locally.
because no one does anything for the good of mankind anymore. you either have to entice them with a personal benefit or force them into it.
I think we should use every available tool. Different people respond to different approaches. Profit-motivated industries will need regulation & enforcement.
Some people respond to positive incentives and others respond to regulations out of fear.
The profit motive works. People are more inclined to volunteer if they can contribute to a good cause, without the cost being painful. At the same time, one sees in nature two types of people: those that abide by the rules and the cheaters. You need regulation just to monitor whether or not the persons followed through with the promises they made. If they applied for a tax credit, did they actually carry out the work. I have invested in solar panels with the help of Oregon Energy Trust, state and federal incentives. I figure that for the cost of a good used car of recent make, I might be able to zero out my carbon foot-print. I did give money to increase wind power. Regulations are also needed because many of us need to be more disciplined. If the cause is good, many of us will contribute to the "war effort". The WWII generation was dubbed by Tom Brokaw as the "Greatest Generation". They willingly sacrificed to fight evil and to make sure that the next generation would survive. Drive at 55 mph. How hard is that? Evidently some found it painful because this regulation ended far too early. Some persons will try to make more money by procrastination, cheating and taking short-cuts. In many ways, China is such an example. The Big 3 automakers of Detroit is another. They fought rules claiming that they could not get high milage cars in the time alloted. Just look at the increase in milage between 2009-2011. With new leadership they have pivoted and now are running profitably while conforming with public needs.
I think it would take both to bring about the kind of changes necessary to decrease our reliance on fossil fuels.
We should pull out all the stops as quickly as we can. We are WAY behind. The Bush administrator delayed us 8 years, and Obama isn't in any hurry.
because there's a lot that needs to be done. so there so be many approaches.
Incentive have the potential to encourage research and investment in new approaches/plants; regulations are needed to push entrenched industries in the right direction.
I don't trust industry to change without some regulations.
Some portion of the population will be motivated by money. Others will need to be forced through regulation.
We need strong incentives so people will be motivated financially to make the changes. I know from personal experience if there was sufficient incentive that was not based on income (in other words, don't cut off the incentive at a minimum income level as so many energy credits are) our household would do significant energy changes. You need regulations in the sense that solar panels have to meet a certain standard and for installation and to meet that standard they will have to meet certain criteria. If we don't have those kind of regulations, I'm afraid you'll have all kinds of failed products and poor installation.
Incentives will help people like me move toward a healthier source of energy. Regulations will help others, less motivated to change, think seriously about switching from fossil fuels to clean energy.
Is a more balanced approach that will involved more entities.
What works for one, doesn't work for another.
It is in our nature to want to maximize short-term economic gain. The only things that motivate individuals and industry to change their habits is to make options economically attractive or easy, and to regulate activities that have negative consequences.
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People react better to incentives, especially profit enterprises. Some items however may still need to be regulated, like having unleaded gasoline, have DMV checks on exhaust of autos, having industry reduce air pollutants, etc.

Incentives give business a reason to be involved -- but there needs to be a push that's beyond that to get people and businesses to begin making changes in how they do their business.

This is the way to get the public involved and not make them feel like they are forced to do it. It would also allow the inventive spirit to flourish!!

Sticks and carrots work.

Regulations are important to enforce and keep incentives.

Because I don’t think incentives alone will make the level of changes necessary.

Gives more personal freedom

Only through enforcement can industry be regulated as the dollar speaks louder than reason.

You can give incentives to people to install solar panels; you can’t put regulations on that. On the other hand you can regulate such things as gas efficiency, where incentives would not likely be effective.

Since incentives and education have been around now over 10 years and many changes still need to be made, it is probably time to add regulations.

Incentives have such a potential for corporations to get greedy in another area that just becomes detrimental in another way. Regulations that are actually enforced by people who genuinely care about the future, the earth, the environment are necessary.

Time is a wastin’ so regulations are now needed (incentives would be good if this weren’t so important).

Incentives are important because they give people the option of saving money. Regulations are important because they provide certainty. But they can also have unintended consequences.

The threat of regulation would push many to using incentives.

People do better when they are rewarded for good actions. When people or corporations will not act in the common good, then regulations need to be in place.

Carrot and stick work better together than either does alone.

Incentives are preferable but may not get us where we need to be quickly enough, so a combination is likely most effective.

You need both

All strategies needed.

The U.S.'s history of environmental protection has been based on very successful regulations of products or processes that are detrimental to environmental quality. Also providing incentives makes it easier for individuals/businesses to follow the regulations and may encourage some to go beyond the bare minimum to reduce carbon emissions.

I feel that in some instances, incentives can promote acceptance to a broader public. However, for the minority of the population (at least in Oregon), climate change is not an issue. Regulations can offer a more policy-based approach that could hopefully not burden people with high fees or taxes but still achieve our objective of reducing carbon footprints.

reward people who voluntarily make the change but then force industry - a lot of them won’t change unless there are regulations

We should encourage everyone to work toward change. Incentives can help the doubters try it, regulations might be needed for those who refuse to consider new options.

Both are good methods of achieving change. Regulation is necessary because many corporations will not change unless forced to. Incentives make this change a little more palatable to the changers.

It is not a one-size-fits-all problem or solution. Some things people may never do at enough of a scale to affect change unless it is required. Incentives only seem to work on the large scale and can be cumbersome to enact and manage the programs.

one source does not fit all circumstances.

Until energy conservation becomes a stronger aspect of our systems, many companies will continue to make decisions based on the bottom-line and not what is right for the planet. So regulations are needed. Especially if retooling is necessary to take advantage of incentives. Incentives are great, as long as people can think
through the whole process and have a vision for how to utilize.

We need to create change as quickly as possible. Both carrots and sticks are needed.

Because it works better than either alone

Because it is the way most successful ventures work. Exclusively one approach is not successful.

Because different behaviors are encouraged or discouraged in different ways. There are no silver bullets in public policy.

Incentives will make the price of clean energy and increased efficiency competitive, but incentives alone can't provide enough stimulus to tip the balance. Regulation is needed for areas of the economy that can't be touched by incentives, and teeth are needed to prosecute those who evade the law.

This mix is more abt to work.

Incentives will move some people to action and are popular, but government can't afford incentives in every sphere of action, so regulations are necessary.

Better results with more choices to achieve the same goals.

I prefer incentives because it allows conscientious individuals and groups to move in an appropriate direction. The benefits from incentive programs are often minimal compared to needs and slow to come to fruition. At some point, regulation is needed to move our community towards an appropriate solution.

Climate change is an issue that is significant enough to warrant both programs.

to keep a balance

so we can get to where we need to be rather than just to the least common denominator

Incentives are always preferable. Regulations are probably required to attain maximum improvements.

People respond to different things. Incentives may influence some people to change, but not others. Climate change is such an important issue that needs to be addressed. We can't wait for everyone to want to change. Some things have to be forced onto people.

Incentives alone don't move markets (just make it less expensive for those who are already in favor of the move to make it). Regulations alone tend to generate more opposition than support. The two together will, over time, both encourage people and businesses to do the right thing and prevent "scoffers" from holding back progress or causing large-scale damage (e.g., clear-cutting old growth, building new high-emissions long-lasting manufacturing or power facilities, etc.).

Neither work on their own. We have had a great deal of tax credit investments (BETC and RETC) over the years and we are still far behind in reducing our carbon emissions across all sectors. By providing suitable incentives paired with regulations, Oregonians can create an alternative future. If we just create new regulations without education, outreach, and incentives (which need not be all financial) then we raise the economic hurdle for sustainable development to the point that we won't generate much investment opportunities. But if we say, yes Oregon is open for business, but we also are very concerned with our quality of life and the impact of our activities on the environment (particularly the carbon cycle) we can create a suitable climate for sustainable investment. Let's get rid of the "get rich quick schemes" that continue the externalization of environmental costs.

People, and particularly businesses, are motivated by money. Regulations threaten to take money from them (so they are more likely to comply) and incentives offer them more money, so they are more likely to do something.

Although there are often many good actors, industry generally does a terrible job of self regulation. Climate leaders should be rewarded, and bad actors should be punished.

By combining both each may be less of a burden to those affected. Also both may be required to achieve needed goals,

Market incentives often promote better adaptation and innovation toward new technologies, some industries are so entrenched and emit so much CO2 that they need to be regulated - specifically coal burning

We are already well into climate change and need to be moving as rapidly as possible to lower greenhouse gases. That 350 target is getting further and further below our present levels. Regulation is needed to stop some of the most egregious emitters, as well as to rule out further deployment of harmful practices. Building codes would seem vital here as well. Incentives are needed to encourage new development as well to assist individuals and businesses to install alternative power sources, promote conservation, and make appropriate renovation more possible. We also need to get rid of regulations which currently get in the way of
Both are needed. Regulations alone are a political nonstarter; incentives not effective enough. It's the mix that works.

Works better with public. Carrots and sticks can sometimes get past ideological screens.

Incentives work only when they are appreciated. Regulations set standards that may be enforced when broken.

Neither will work alone

You have to reward as well as enforce.

Regulations are needed to establish caps on the amount of greenhouse gases that can be emitted. Incentives are needed to encourage people to change behaviors.

This problem is so large in scope its going to take everything

Regulations will satisfy those who want the regulations. Incentives will satisfy those filled with greed for the green. Both parties happy and collaborating. Need 2 hands to clap.

We have to force people to do things. Voluntary changes aren't working

people respond poorly when on the STICK is applied

As with every other situation when dealing with people, humans seem to respond well to incentives (there's something immediate in it for them). But, it's way too late to rely solely on incentives. There have to be regulations and lots of them very quickly and NOW.

A mixed approach is probably most effective in making changes relatively quickly

You can't have a one size fits all approach, and different issues work better with different incentive structures. Regulations work well for maintaining positive behavior and maintaining accountability, while incentives work well to get people to take the initiative to start a behavior.

Incentives to alternative sources, taxation/regulation of carbon sources; elimination of subsidies to oil and gas.

Incentives are good but they cost taxpayer money so a few of them go a long ways. Regulations are a necessary thing to ascertain that applications are done properly.

Incentives alone can become outdated even though they were once effective. Like Oil/gas tax incentives.

Ethanol a bad one in that it isn't efficient and reduces food. Incentives can, though, point the way to solutions. They need to be monitored and revised. Regulations can make more rapid changes and can also steer. The world has both producers and users. What might steer one might not steer the other and vice versa.

Universal compliance is goal -- not enough $$$ to offer tax incentives for all. Some percentage will never comply or figure it out unless compelled to do so -- like most other polluters.

This is a long-term change in how we live in Oregon, and it takes time to get everyone on board (incentive) before specific regulations can be effective

Incentives motivate positive action. Regulations are needed because the climate crisis is so dire.

Incentives give people a chance to do what is right for the next generation by choice. A large percentage of the population will not do the right thing without regulations.

It would maximize industry buy-in to renewable energy.

People have to change their personal habits. That won't happen without incentives and encouragement.

Some regulation is needed to make sure we don't exhaust scarce non-renewable resources, and don't continue to use polluting techniques to live cheaply.

Most people in America need to be incentivized to take any type of action; business people and industrialists have a long history of not making changes for the good of whole unless forced to do so though regulations.

Because incentives can help some people get the improvements that they would not be able to otherwise afford, regulations because there are going to be some who will go against the rules because they think they are exempt.

People are slow to accept change on their own. Folks are not generally forward thinking and only see the immediate. We need to PAY it FORWARD-----to generations yet unborn.

Human nature. Different strokes for....etc.

Because one without the other is rarely effective. We need strong regulations along with incentives. Landfill
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bans, required waste management plans, mileage standards, fees for "over large" single family homes....all necessary, along with incentives for desirable behaviors.

Both will be necessary to reach the level of change needed with the urgency needed.

Because we can't wait for incentives alone to do the job.

That approach MIGHT work

we need to do all we can to move toward sustainability

Well, what we really need is a higher consciousness but that approach has never been developed but rather the opposite has been inculcated into this pro-waste, pro-disposable, consumer society. BUT they have been exposed to bribe and beat training of one sort and or another to one degree or another so that concept isn't too foreign to their up-bringing to work while we are waiting to see if evolution includes development of a consciousness (although so far, it doesn't appear to be the case)...

Being a regulatory for my full-time job it's easy to see that many folks don't like being told what they can and cannot do on their property, but some of that is required to protect our environment. By adding incentives you help to encourage folks to do what they should be doing and they feel better about the decision in the long run since it was their "choice."

Use the best of each. Regarding regulations, as I mentioned earlier, if we ultimately cannot change the course of events, then having spent all our resources trying in vain is an exercise in futility and dooms us to more suffering. Bottom Line: they should be the RIGHT regulations. ,

We need both to be successful in creating change.

Because it will please more people on various sides of the issues.

I believe that when trying to encourage change in peoples' behavior, a varied approach is best. Some will respond to the incentives. Those who do not, will hopefully follow regulations.

research incentive for renewable non polluting energy

then it effects everybody

Incentives are something people react well to, and will try, though some people will not respond to incentives. But climate change is so important that it is imperative that it is solved. So there must also be regulation for those who would not voluntarily participate, even when offered incentives.

Our existing base energy sources already receive incentives, so to bring alternative energy sources in at a competitive price we need to level the playing field. Although I've been a solar energy advocate for 30 years I wouldn't have been able to afford my solar collector system without the generous tax credits (now gone).

Regulations are also needed to insure ongoing energy supply (solar easements, land use measures to allow alternative energy generation with minimum regulation) and to, if necessary, force the transition from nonrenewable to renewable energy.

We need to employ all possible methods, as the situation is critical. Individuals and corporations are not doing a good job of regulating ourselves.

Incentives alone are insufficient while regulations are only as good as their enforcement. Those who wish to be responsible guardians of the planet will respond to incentives; those who could care less about anything but their personal and corporate profits will do nothing unless forced to make changes

If we only use incentives (as has been done with tax breaks, etc.), there is less change to solar than if the utilities are mandated to provide it. (As I think PPL is doing in the valley by "leasing" panels to its customers.)

Some industries respond better to incentives

It appears that incentives should do most of the heavy lifting--especially with carbon taxes and broadly distributed dividends from those taxes--but we need an outright carbon emissions cap as well. Meanwhile, nothing but regulation will shut down coal-fired power plants and coal-fired cement plants, and land use regulations are needed to control wasteful sprawl.

I feel the more important issues probably need regulations. Incentives would probably do the trick for less important issues.

Regulations have to make sense and incentives have to actually work. If it all becomes a political one up man-ship then we will get nowhere. We all want the same thing...a vibrant planet to live on...the how is always the problem. Utilities should become public...for the people and electricity should be free.

Everyone likes incentives! However, as a country, we need regulations to keep industry in line.
That seems as the level way to do things. people love getting stuff for doing good. but there has to be some regulation for it as well.

one solution probably won’t be enough

Incentives do work if well-designed in guiding both consumers and industry. The devil in the detail is that interests so often own the process to game the system. The ethanol disaster is point #1 on this. We need simpler incentives created by actual people and not tools of the system (i.e. politicians and lobbyists). Regulations work very well when (again) well-designed, simple, and enforceable. They also work when accountability is built in. They really work well when the tail doesn’t wag the dog (i.e. letting industry and bought-paid politicians write them). The Gulf spill is a great example where regulations were worthless.

Humans respond to the carrot and stick approach. Incentives encourage people to do the right thing. Regulation enforcement encourages them not to do the wrong thing.

something has to be done. most sheeple don’t use the brains they have in their heads and will have to be rewarded in some way or another to see the results

carrot and stick

Climate change is a huge emergency. A lot must be done ASAP.

the bell curve! some folks respond to incentives, some do not but do respond to reg’s

Because the problem is so extreme that it requires both - and even more!

Different people and companies respond differently to motivations so I believe a mix of incentives works better than using just one. I have to admit that if I were in autocratic control I would like to regulate theheck out of factors that impact climate change.

Climate change is an urgent and serious problem that needs a multi-pronged and comprehensive approach.

incentives are perceived as less threatening, but some will not respond and need regulations.

We need all the tools available.

I feel gov needs to take a stand and establish limits, general direction, whereas it is up to individuals to decide how to comply

On most environmental issues, there is no one silver bullet. Regulations are good at limiting bad behavior, but they don’t work that well for promoting good behavior or fostering innovation. That’s why you need incentives as well.

We all have to be taxed and rewarded for our climate change behaviors.

This covers moer ground and has a more positive “sell” than regulation alone.

If the democrats AND republicans are unhappy, then you know you’re getting somewhere.

we need a carrot and stick approach to protect our future. Corporate profits are NOT the most important issue.

Incentives-only may be too expensive for the state. Regulations-only seem a bit harsh, and we really all need to be working on this together.

it will take all - industry responds to both, yet many will only do something after regulations are passed (fuel efficiency standards, emission controls etc.); citizens respond to both too - many use incentives to get the ball rolling and help build the industry, others need to be forced to make the changes.

Social change is difficult. The more tools used, the more flexibility individuals will have to pick a methodology that works for their lives.

That seems like the best way for people to move ahead - pushed and pulled - how can you beat it?

For the regular person, incentives will work much better - and be much better PR for any political action. Mandates to individuals will generally be met with knee-jerk anger at “Big Brother”, this is America. At the same time, large corporations, particularly multinationals, don’t particularly care about climate change because it will disproportionately affect the poor. They will drag their feet until the very end to keep from having to change their business model, so they must be incentivized through regulations. This way they will be forced to factor it into their business model. Corporations are notoriously short sided because they are obligated to never cease generating immediate profits. This type of model makes it hard to make upfront investments to prepare for long term changes, even if those changes would wreak incredible damage to the company in the long run. Many businesses right now don’t factor in the long term societal externalities of climate change into their business models. As history has shown us again and again, from the Clean Air Act to cigarettes to seat belts, business will always scream that its impossible to change and will nuke the entire
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economy if regulated. Then when regulations are in place - the world keeps turning and we're a lot better off. Human greed must be tempered with regulation at the business level.

hmmm...
You need targets to be set and enforced. You also need to tap into human greed with incentives. whatever it takes to get people and industry to do the right thing.
People seem to respond positively to incentives in Oregon, and the regulations help guide folks in the right direction.
Positive reinforcement. Less criticism.
Incentives are nice, but not much has ever been accomplished without the stick approach
This is an urgent issue that requires broad-scale action. I should add that given the current national political and cultural climate offering incentives is likely to be more practical to implement. I suspect that the "no-nothings" will block any significant action. I'm not optimistic about the course of this climate thing.
A mix makes the process more positive and less autocratic. Perhaps that would help dampen opposition. There is a segment of society that will not respond unless there is profit as well as a segment that will tie things up in court if regulations appear to be too restrictive.
Both approaches work for most people most of the time.
I think that positive influence works the best (i.e. incentives), but there must also be regulated standards that at least set the minimum/maximum allowable participation/emissions.
I think incentives are more important, but they work better in tandem with regulations. Plus, I don't think that government should provide to many incentives because there are many instances of businesses taking advantage of them while not actually doing what is right for the public and for the environment.
People change behavior based on incentives. Companies change behavior based on regulations. I also want something implemented that isn't vulnerable to a changing political climate. Solutions take a long time for the positive effects to be realized and, in general, the public has a short attention span and has been trained to expect instant gratification through just about every other avenue in life like technology that is continually more convenient to the user. I'm frustrated by the spin that often happens when people are trying to do something positive.
Actually both - with the underpinning being education. The US has always been entrepreneurial and inventive, a forward thinker in the past that required investment in future technologies. Why are we so reluctant to take the lead now. Our local and federal government needs to regulate those that are greedy and inspire and invest in those who think.
Using a dual-faceted approach ensures greater coverage of emissions' sources.
I think we will need both in order to achieve the desired outcomes.
Right now there are great incentives for solar and yet not many people are doing it. We need to make carbon-based energy sources more expensive through taxes and subsidize renewables with the tax money.
Because voluntary programs generally fail - I have set up several at DEQ. Those that are more regulatory with incentives do better over time and have a larger impact.
Incentives alone tend to become expensive subsidies to industries that often don't need them or take advantage of them. Regulations alone are reactive: i.e., they only direct what cannot be done, not what should be done. Also, the best regulations often require enormous amounts of political capital and, if they finally do get adopted, they then get weakened over time as the people and industries regulated "capture" the regulators.
Balance
Some companies need a boost, some need a paddle
Provides more flexibility
The change needs to be mandated through law and incentive based to spur innovation and growth.
Incentives tend to motivate a different subset of entities than regulations do. Using both could cover a larger group of parties.
reward good punish bad
A lot needs to be done quickly, so we need to do everything that works.
The incentives help individuals who are willing to change on a household level, incentives such as rebates or
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coupons for upgrading appliances such as water heaters. Regulations challenge retailers to up the efficiency in their products.
We seem to need both to make change.
We've seen that incentives, which help a lot, are not sufficient when people are faced with difficult choices. Regulation has been shown here and in Europe to be very effective.
because no one policy works everywhere
Regulations alone just don't work. Incentives work for the motivated. There are many procrasitnators out there, but if there's someone making you clean your room (regulations) and stepping in to help fold your clothes to make it easier (incentives), then many more businesses would be willing to participate.
so that the industrialists and corporations will do it. Neither one is enough alone; and they'll find some way around it.
it will work
Incentives are affective in some cases but for major change to happen regulations are sometimes necessary
I think that is a good way to help people and industry make changes.
I think a carrot and a stick approach is warrented with this large an issue. I do not want to see incentives given to dirty energy and I think an incentives only approach would be the target of exploitation. Besides the state needs to increase its tax base,
Some things need to be treated differently. For example - Oregon brings back the 55 Mile Per Hour Speed Limit to cut back on the carbon. Well, that would require regulations and enforcement. Incentives could encourage someone to buy a bus pass and use it. They both have their place...
Carrot stick.
The problem requires serious and multifaceted approach
To get things moving. The more pressure on those causing climate change.
I think it's always useful to offer a carrot to businesses, so we should at least try. But we have been trying for at least a decade with very little progress. Now we need regulation to break movement free. And regulations level the playing field for everyone, and motivate the supply chain to change as well.
Regulation because the corporate energy world has proven itself too greedy to trust. Incentives to prime the pump, especially for basic R&D.
We need to go at this with everything we can.
Because some people will do it if they have an incentive, and most business won't do anything unless they are forced to.
Because incentives favor progressive thinkers, while regulations are absolutely critical for conservative constitutions to make the changes that we DESPERATELY need to make SOON.
Many people will be encouraged to act by incentives. Those that will not act on their own with incentives must be forced to act by regulation. Incentives first then if the result is not sufficient improvement, regulate.
Not everyone trusts government standard-setting, so some incentive-based inducements ought to be utilized, as well.
makes t he most sense
Change is difficult to achieve. Use all tools
n = 249

80 Why don't you think incentives or regulations are an appropriate approach to climate change issues?
They would have devastating economic impact with little or no impact on the future of the earth's climate.
The government should not control wht we do on every level. I like clean air and using less electricity, but I do that of my own accord and I don't need any more regulations coming out of the Government whether it be local, state, or federal. Please take a look at Spain who has tried to force Green Energy down the throats of its citizens and see what is happening there. Its not sunshine and lollypops. The are broke because of the Green initiatives.
Incentives are too expensive, regulations remove personal choice. Spending some money to develope more fuel efficient products, better batteries, and population control would be a more positive approach and develope long-term changes. The current push for wind power as an answer is a "flavor of the month" approach that wastes
money and will not provide long-term positive outcome. It causes too much damage to justify the energy it produces.

I don’t think climate change issues are approachable by the government. I see the potential of a lot of economic, lifestyle, and human rights disruptions with a dubious effect on a problem that has yet to be meaningfully demonstrated. I’m tired of government solutions to predicted problems, resulting in imaginary resolutions.... It’s the whole “jobs saved” by stimulus money fantasy all over again. You can make up any numbers you want, when you’re proving that you prevented something that you predicted would happen.

I think by providing incentives you would be defeating the purpose... Incentives usually = lower costs and/or credits that are really just a lie. Nothing is free. We will all continue to pay for it. As for additional regulations, I’m just not a fan regulating people to death for a “cause”.

What is the incentive? As for regulations, we are up to our ears with rules and regulations.

I think it is better to allow people the freedom to make their own choices about how they spend their money. The climate change issue is an agenda that is being pushed on us without regard to our own intelligence and ability to make good choices without some kind of financial “incentive”. Please do not try to bully me into something I cannot in good conscience believe in. Climate change is one of those things. It appears to have fallen into the hands of extremists who will not be satisfied until every citizen adheres to their perfect little agenda no matter what the cost in spite of the fact that it is an opinion and not a unavoidable truth.

We already have too many government regulations. Educate the people, people will respond correctly.

I think there is little, or nothing, man can do to control or have any effect on climate change.

Because, those regulations and incentives are derived from private agendas not on scientific foundation.

It is a scheme to re-distribute money. It is not grounded in science. Why would we engage in this poppy-cock and China and India have no intention of wrecking their economic system with this scheme? It has not worked in Europe and has not improved their, greenhouse gas levels!

Government already has too much regulation and control over our lives

This is not a Constitutional role of government. Free markets and the people should decide how and when and IF things like you’re proposing should be implemented.

How do you hold a wave upon the sand? Most of the guys I know that work for government can’t tell you the difference between static and dynamic analysis. So, what is the purpose of this question, to underscore the complexities of climate modeling? Or, to underscore the willingness of a certain class of government drones to accept willingly whatever they have been told they must believe? Given the lack of education in the bureaucratic establishment, understanding issues, like the intended effects and benefits of ”incentives or regulations” is laughable. Few, if any, government employees can tell you the difference between micro- and macro-economics. Modeling incentives or regulations to derive the expected benefits seems a bit out of reach for those same folks, doesn’t it?

You don’t know enough about climate change to be in a reasonable position to reward or punish, and even if you did, it’s not a governmental function. See: Constitution, Bill of Rights.

Our lawmakers have far more they should be focusing on instead of climate change: -American Sovereignty as it relates to the value of the dollar and the National Debt that is increasingly being held by foreigners. -Reform of unsustainable entitlement programs (Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid).

The market should determine this. Government trying to control things with incentives or regulations ALWAYS has unintended consequences that hurt the taxpayer. If you leave it up to the marketplace and something does not work out then a particular business fails and that is the end of the story.

Climate change is a natural occuring cycle. Government involvement will not help a "problem" that dosent exist. Regulations would only drive up the cost of living. We all need to be as energy effecient as possible, but the proposed regulations will only push us toward third world status. If you want to see what the "green economy" has done just look at Spain, the worst unemployment of any industrial nation. It is estimated that for every one green job mandated, 2.1 other jobs have been lost. That is not an example of sound policy!

The FIRST approach has to be to garner public trust and will. As mentioned this can be done by building a robust infrastructure that will support evacuees from sister cities and by having all community projects go through a climate change scientific review to make sure that natural disaster response is anticipated including those that are more and more risk prone because of climate change. Without public will, which is where we are now, there is no way that incentives or regulations will pass public approval, no matter how well intentioned. And the emphasis needs to be on saving money with conservation and far-sighted programs to gain public support. Voters are smart and they want to know what is in it for them and they want the least cost for the most benefit for themselves and
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the future. No voter will vote against conservation or emergency preparedness and initiatives to prepare for the effects of global warming need to be "framed" in that context. Even suggesting carbon tax or giving clean energy credits builds opponents. However conservation can be subsidized without problem provided the conservation is tied to saving money by avoiding costly expenditures such as larger water facilities.

Climate changes are natural occurrences and mans efforts to effect it are a waste of resources and energy. To damn much government regulation now and way to many bureacrats. Too much government intervention...stay out of our lives unless it involves murder or injury to others, which is the fallacy that global warming is portraying. Knock it off

Climate change is bogus government control over our lives. It's not real. Because man-caused climate change is a farse/hoax.

Government control of everything within our lives is not the answer. Government needs less control.

Get government out of my life. My SS check is $550 a month now just what incentives do you think will cause me to spend what little I get on something that I don't believe-in in the first place. The weather goes in cycles, not 20 years, but 100s of years. The Oklahoma dust bowl of the 30s wasn't caused by man, or climate change, but a variation in the jet stream that left them high and dry. It will happen again and again; and one day we will have another ice age too. It's all in the geological record, maybe someone should check out the history of weather instead of the present record.

Because I don't believe that my tax dollars should be used to provide incentives for others to buy products that they should be buying for their own good and the good of the environment. People should stop putting their hand out for Uncle Sam (aka other taxpayers) to subsidize their existence. And, Uncle Sam needs to get out of the nanny business and let people grow up and take care of themselves. Many have been on welfare for generations--this has to stop.

Because I don't believe climate change is a result of mans activities. Dixie Lee Ray stated in her book titled "Trashing the Planet" that if mankind went on an intentional mission to destroy the planet, it could not be done. There are too many biological process in place to take care of us.

There is nothing we can do to influence climate. Both approaches are based upon a false premise. Both are going to further ruin our economy.

more goverment control
I dont think we have a problem
If you think climate control is government responsiblity lets have a popular vote on the subject. Government already controls far to much.

They don't really work. Most people would be "up in arms" if they HAD to have more regulations and our economy should not support yet another incentive.

there is no climate problems.

I saw more carbon emissions during the Mt. Saint Helens eruption than all the US could produce. I think incentives or reglations will not effect climate change.

If there is not a problem (and there isn't) don't fix it. To much government involvement.

No action is needed to fix a problem that does not exist. Any action will cost jobs, money and time, that we can ill afford for the next decade, maybe the economy will be back by then.

Climate change is just that; the climate changes. We cannot regulate or incentivize the climate. Human activity does not have an impact on the global climate but an individual can grow a wind block and a shaded area, etc.

The Government has no business in peoples lives. The only place it should protect us is against itself and big business practices and global control schemes. The "Carbon Conspiracy," George Soros, Bretton Woods, Basal accord 3, Opec, Global Oil Barrons etc.

This is not a problem the government can regulate or provide incentives to solve.

It is just another program that drives up taxes to support the pay backs.

incentives means it will cost the tax payer. don't need more regulations

I don't buy the climate change issues.

Let the free market decide

THE GOVERNMENT IMPOSES TOO DAMN MANY REGULATIONS AS IT IS. It should be a personal choice, based on one's financial status and ability. Any regulations end up imposing penalties on those who can least afford them.
The fact is that most alternative approaches to energy are very expensive to produce and acquire and while it might reduce one’s carbon footprint, it is NOT cost effective and the purchaser may never realize any cost savings benefit.

I still don’t think Climate Change is within our ability to control. All this is merely a cover for ’Big Government’, Globalization, and destruction of the American Middle Class. Elitism is alive and well in this country.

Prove that the atmosphere does not clean itself, it recycles itself. There is no proof that the atmospheric changes are not cyclical.

We need government out of lives not more involved.

Climate change occurs naturally and putting additional regulations and taxes in place is just another way to limit our growth and will have no impact on the climate.

Because it’s all about control by GOVERNMENT!!!!!! and not the people. Your taking our freedoms away and making everything much more expensive.

Because the concept is ridiculous. The climate change scam is based on junk science and it really amazes me that there are supposedly educated, intelligent people pimping the hoax. Meanwhile, the Al Gores are getting rich off of the farce.

Because there is no scientific consensus concerning the effect of carbon on climate. The regulations suggested would be a net negative on the economy for no good reason other than increasing government power.

I think that the government is not intelligent enough to make the decisions on whether climate change is effected by humans or if we are experiencing natural cycles in weather patterns. It seems that those supporting climate change are engaged in self justification and have little to no credibility.

Climate change has been more tied to the PDO than human activities. Let the free market do its best, let regulations fill in on real environmental/health impacts (and CO2 is not a pollutant).

Because what we do as human beings has no effect on climate change. We could stop all production, use no power and you would not see a change in anything. I have been listening to people predict the doom and gloom of our civilization through climate change, or global warming or whatever. Most of the ideas of Climate change by human beings has been debunked, pure and simply.

Why do you think it’s the government’s job to even be involved?

Climate change is a minor issue. Anthropogenic effects have been over estimated, and there is no looming catastrophe which needs to be addressed by government.

Government should stay out of our business. I am a free market person.

No BIG government... they are trying to regulate everything and make the American people dependent on them.

Of course not! How can one possibly create any incentive or regulation for a thing that does not exist? There are no Climate Change Issues, that mankind itself can do one minute thing about. Consider the latest eruption in Iceland. That placed more Carbon in the atmosphere in three days, than man has in one hundred thousand years. You actually believe that little pimple headed man is going to make one tiny bit of difference? One grain of sand from the whole World’s beach will be missed? Fools.

Government needs to get out of our lives. It’s not the government’s job to do this sort of thing. You may say to yourself, “If the government doesn’t do it, who will.” No one. IF, there is a need for such a thing, a private business would do an excellent job and make money at it in the process. The government overspends, loses money and makes a mess out of everything it touches.

Because it is a religion and a power play by people wanting control.

It’s big government.

It is political and I will fight anything imposed by democrats.

Climate change is a hoax to create unnecessary regulations and programs to deal with naturally occurring changes in climate. Regulations add unnecessary costs to everyday living and hurt the economy. Incentives are great, except that someone has to pay for them.

I think manmade Climate Change is a crock of crap.

As stated previously, I believe “climate change” to be a political agenda.

Government is limited in what it can do by the Constitution, and this aint one of them.

Once again, “climate change” or “global warming” or whatever you choose to call it today, is a fraud.

climate change has always occurred. The government can’t pave roads or educate children; what gives anyone the audacity to posit the government could create a static climate? The government can’t even tell me what the
weather will be 3 days from now...

Get the government out of the way so the creative process can work. The demand will be met by the entrepreneurs

Because the underlying premise is flawed. Remove the lie of climate change being the reason we need regulation and incentives, and have the debate and based on providing a cleaner healthier environment by doing things that have a positive economic impact because there is a private citizen/sector demand for them. We have too many regulations already limiting or even crippling our business here in the US. More regulation by politicians, bureaucratic and special interest groups based on flawed information, speculation and bad science is not helping get us to results that are actually beneficial. Incentives only work to help viable and needed ideas and projects get to a point of sustainability on their own. Incentives or subsidies for projects like wind farms and photo-cell solar arrays waste money, taxpayer money, and BILLIONS of dollars are being wasted on these projects. Wind and solar are not viable solutions anywhere in the near or foreseeable future.

I do not believe the government should be in this business.

Because it involves a bunch of brain dead bureaucrats who couldn't earn a living in the free market.

I think most of the people getting paid to report in the climate change industry are doing their best to prolong jobs for themselves by reporting unverified information

There are no climate change "issues" Climate change is normal......

We don't have the technology right now to make a difference. It is a waste of money and hurts the economy.

I believe government needs to get out of the way and let private business do what they do well. Way to much government.

too much government regulation now!

It makes it difficult for energy companies to conduct and stay in business. The government should let the free market decide which energy sources to use.

Because the climate is out of our control and we already have too much governmental control in our lives.

As I said, climate change is a scam thought up by high ranking politicians to line their pockets and those of their rich friends. Scientists that promote human caused climate change are like lawyers that manufacture a problem that they themselves must solve to create a need and a paycheck.

I don't think the Govt. should do anything

MORE RULES, REGULATIONS AND LAWS!! Thats just what we need is more rules crammed down our throats by people that don't have a clue. just like the big squirrel hunt back in the 50's. Our government thought that the squirrels were killing the forest off so they killed millions of them only to find out that the squirrels were actually helping by replanting the seeds they ate. Isn't mother nature amazing!! But when ever man gets involved with mother nature they SCREW IT UP!!

Because climate is always changing, with or without humans. In most cases any and all regulations will be anti business and increase costs to customers. Incentives should be based on profitability. We incent solar and wind 10 times that of fossil fuels and those forms of energy will never turn a profit. I don't want my tax money wasted.

more public employees at taxpayer expense

I don't think any regulation or incentive will have an effect on climate change. just bankrupt the country. Just another tax

The government needs to stay out of it. they already have their nose in too much and everything they touch gets screwed up. Americans are smart, we can do what needs to be done without "Big Brother" telling us what to do.

Incentives would be good ---- but government intervention, enforcements -- I am tired of. Cumborsome and expensive. Government needs to start running more efficiently and economically.

climate change is NOT a man made problem. the earth has been getting colder and hotter since forever STUPID

I support a market based approach. People will purchase what they value, believe in and are willing to pay for.

Government subsidies hide the true costs of producing power.

The gov needs to get the hell out of it

I am not convinced that MMGW is an issue. Government involvement is another impediment to business and individual freedoms. Also has obvious costs which are most often increasing and uncontrolled due to political agendas, not business sense.

To some there are climate change issues, mostly conceived by a unproven theory. To govern and regulate based on faulty conclusions and the greed associated with those who are in line to gain montarily is a fool's errand. Those
pay will have less, and those who receive will have more. It’s basically a war of the classes (and government wants a piece).

Because human-caused climate change is absolutely junk science - the planet and the sun control cyclical climate change. Anyone who believes anything else is sadly deceived and misinformed.

The government invariably makes huge mistakes that cannot be changed, and interferes with the market based economy that is necessary for our progress.

because we have too many already and no one has truly defined climate change

As discussed earlier, global warming... err... climate change...err... global climate disruption is exaggerated by the environmentalists to push their agenda. This is why they keep changing the name. This is why their leaders were forced to falsify their data (eg: UN documents, emails, etc.) Data shows that the earth has been on a cooling trend over the past 15 years. Virtually all of their dire predictions have failed- like rising ocean levels. If the entire N. Pole cap melted, it wouldn’t raise the ocean level an inch because it is floating ice. Earth science 101.

Any governmental approach will be, as with all governmental approaches, substantially flawed

WE THE PEOPLE, what part of that don’t you get. Not we the government, smaller government less regulation and more free market exchange, people who use energy will select what they want to buy and use without government intervention

Because this survey is based totally without merit. The climate change fear mongers are just that. This earth was created with weather cycles that extend over thousands of years. Yes, we have smog in some large cities, but that has nothing to with climate change. Smog is man-made, but doesn’t change the earth weather patters to any significant degree. Basically, climate change promoters are nothing more that shills for certain type of industries like wind and solar. Just get off our backs and out our pocketbooks and this country can survive very, very, well-- without this climate change non-sense.

Quite re-engineering the world over theory and mythlogy.

Needs to market driven.

Because there is no scientific evidence that global warming exists. We are currently in a global cooling state but its the weather and it is moderated by the SUN. Why are we experiencing cooler weather right now? Why do we have record snow pack right now? Oh, because global warming? When India, China and all other 3rd world countries have infrastructure to support wind farms, solar panels and all their citizens are driving electric cars then maybe we should join in but not until then.

Government creates nothing, no product, just people sucking off others.

Climate change is political. Many climatologists, meteorologists, etc totally disagree. This is all based on a few, politically selected opinions

Why don't you hippie assholes go fuck yourselves?!

Who said "Climate Change" is an issue. This question is just another terrible twist of words so that you can say that people demand change when most see this for the garbage science it is.

Once again: The belief in climate change is more a matter of sensibility than sense. It is a pretense, a cause célèbre, employed by adherents of the environmental movement to advance their agenda. The environmental movement couples a loathing of mankind with a Rousseauian aesthetic sensibility. The sole legitimate function of government is the protection of property. Climate change incentives and regulations are expensive and harmful.

Because the whole premise of human caused climate change is false.

Keep the hands of government OFF.

keep government out of the picture; drill baby drill-off the coast and in every corner of the country

It is not governments role! Read the Constitution! Let the market drive innovations! Get government out of our lives! Prime example, Department of Energy formed in the 70’s to reduce our consumption of foreign oil! They have done a wonderful job! They started at 25% foreign oil imports to today, over 75%! What a great example of government intervention!

Climate change is natural occuring and we would have a very difficult time impacting it.

Tax carbon emissions.

I am tire of the Nanny State attempting to control every phase of my life based upon the opinion of a few elite citizens. I am very tired of green when as a farm I have been an active environmentalist not an environmental activist who has no clue about resource management to produce the food Americans and the world population need to sustain life.
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because "global climate change" IE global warming is not based on solid scientific evidence and is simply another way for the government to find another thing to tax us for, and BTW exhaling creates CO2, so will be taxed on how often we exhale next?

afasdfafda

Incentives and regulations are not necessary since climate change is not significantly affected by man made emissions.
The govt. is already entrenched too deeply in our daily lives.

LEAVE IT TO GOD!!

When you aren't answering surveys, what do you do?

(Other responses filled in)

self employed (have been for 20 years)

Self Employed

Interview veterans for the Library of Congress

Homemaker, homeschooler, Constitutional scholar, writer.

I work 32hrs/wk by choice, because that is what I need to lead a balanced and healthy life.

University Professor

self employed

self-employed

Schedule to erratic for volunteering so write checks to compensate. Fortunate I can do that.

Criminal

at home dad

work as a OD consultant, self-employed

community involvement

Writer

Activist in bringing together traditionally antagonistic groups for mutual benefit.

Citizen lobbyist

Work really hard all the time...and love spending the other amount with my family

land use consultant

Sustainable Solutions - Renewable Energy & Home Performance contractor

retired public school teacher, climate activist

Work on building our homestead. Clergy and elder in my spiritual community.

business owner

Work to support and preserve the Constitution of the United States, as it is written, and to offer my assistance to those who share my ideals and principles.

disabled forced retirement

Publish a newspaper exposing the myths of man caused climate change.

looking to make a difference - I long to pay it forward

read, write my elected officials

have been working on sustainability issues for over 40 years

self employed

writer

Business owner

Outdoor enthusiast
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Why do you want to know?
Consulting
conciencious landlord
Business owner
Business Owner
Anoy liberals and idiots.
Graphic/Web Designer/Visionary
Work around the house and play.
restore oak groves and native habitat
Ride and race dirt motortycles
business owner, mother, wife, community member, green-life studying
disabled
Manage investments and enjoy life.
initiator of community education opportunities
High school teacher
contract consultant
retired physician
None of your business.
To pay taxes caused by regulations like this.
farmer/rancher
citizen activist
Try to earn a living in this shit Obama economy
I am also a Precinct Committee person and I own a small business in Bend.
work at growing our own food
Self-employed scientist.
gsfgsfg
educator
Also volunteer on environmental and health issues.
I just lost my part-time job
Enviromental consultant, retired from DEQ
work various jobs
Disabled
Union organizer
Work Part Time
preach sermons about global warming etc

\( n = 67 \)

What elected position do you hold?
Mt. Scott-Arleta Neighborhood Association Board member, City of Portland
City Councilor, School Board, Oakridge Schools/Westfir City Council
Board of Directors,
PCP, Deschues County
School Board member, Redmond
Friendly Area Neighborhood Executive Board - 10 + years, City of Eugene -
Neighborhood Program
CITY COUNCILOR,
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