

To: Poulton, Teri (Consoldane)[redacted@bp.com]; Streett, Mary [redacted@bp.com]; Ellis, Joe [redacted@bp.com]; Raftery, Becky [redacted@uk.bp.com]; Sidoti, Elizabeth [redacted@bp.com]; Miner, Robert [redacted@bp.com]; Stout, Robert [redacted@bp.com]; Scher, Robert [redacted@bp.com]; Keigher, Connolly (Procom) [redacted@bp.com]; Cochrane, Phil [redacted@bp.com]; Brady, Pamela [redacted@bp.com]; McKeon, Rayanne B [redacted@bp.com]; Denny Eliason [redacted@alliancesnw.com]
From: Wolf, Tom [O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=THOMAS.WOLF]
Sent: Sat 13/10/2018 1:36:57 PM (UTC)
Subject: READ: Washington NO on 1631 | News Clips (10.12.18)
[KUOW - Will Washington lead the nation on a carbon tax this November \(10.12.18\).pdf](#)
[The Olympian \(Editorial\) - I-1631- If no carbon fee now, when \(10.11.18\).pdf](#)
[Columbia I-1631 Report.pdf](#)
[National Catholic Reporter - Washington bishops urge voters to carefully weigh clean air initiative \(10.12.18\).pdf](#)
[The Daily News- PUD Commissioners talk I-1631, wind farms \(10.12.18\).pdf](#)
[The Redmond Reporter \(Op-Ed\) - I am going all in on Initiative 1631 \(10.12.18\).pdf](#)
[USA Today \(Op-Ed\) - States can lead the way on climate change policy as Trump rolls back protections \(10.12.18\) .pdf](#)

Redacted - First Amendment

Tom

NO ON 1631 | DAILY NEWS CLIPS

IN-STATE DAILIES, TV or RADIO

10/10/18

TVW (TV)

The Impact

Mike Callahan

[Source](#)

10/11/18

The Olympian (Editorial)

I-1631: If no carbon fee now, when?

The Olympian Editorial Board

[Sources](#)

10/11/18

KING 5 (TV)

Farmers disagree on value of Washington's carbon initiative

Alison Morrow

[Source](#)

10/11/18

KGW (TV)

Straight Talk with Laural Porter

[Source](#)

10/12/18

Redmond Reporter (Op-Ed)

I am going all in on I-1631

Mark Vossler

[Source](#)

10/12/18

The Daily News

PUD Commissioner candidates talk I-1631, wind farms

Alex Bruell

[Source](#)

10/12/18

KUOW

Will Washington lead the nation on a carbon tax this November?

Angela King & Jason Pagano

[Source](#)

10/12/18

News Talk (Radio)

Surprise! 17 WA Labor Unions Join to Oppose I-1631

John McKay

[Source](#)

NATIONAL NEWS

10/12/18

USA Today (Op-Ed)

States can lead the way on climate change policy as Trump rolls back protections

Abigail Dillen

[Source](#)

10/12/18

National Catholic Reporter

Washington bishops urge voters to carefully weigh clean air initiative

Catholic News Service

[Source](#)

10/12/18

Columbia SPIA (Report)

A Carbon Tax Under Real World Constraints: Examining Concerns With Washington's Initiative 1631

Noah Kaufman

[Source](#)

10/10/18

TVW (TV)

The Impact

Mike Callahan

[Source](#)

10/11/18

The Olympian (Editorial)

I-1631: If no carbon fee now, when?

The Olympian Editorial Board

[Sources](#)

Washington has dithered like most U.S. states when it comes to putting a pollution price on greenhouse gas emitters.

Fossil fuels that produce these gases are undeniably linked to global warming. And, Initiative 1631, which is on the Nov. 6 ballot, offers the best chance for The Evergreen State to take a step to wean our economy off petroleum-based fuels.

If approved by voters, our state would join California, which has a successful cap-and-trade pollution credits program, and New England states that use a pollution-credits scheme to encourage utilities to reduce their power-plant emissions.

The real question for Washington voters is: If not now, then when?

That is why we urge passage of I-1631, while recognizing the initiative may need state legislators to give it strong oversight.

What I-1631 would do first is put a “carbon fee “ on some of the state’s biggest emitters of greenhouse gases. The \$15 per metric ton rate would rise over time, as needed, to meet state emission-reduction targets.

The fee could add as much as 14 cents initially in 2020 to the cost of a gallon of gasoline.

This “fee” — which unlike a tax must be used for energy-related activities such as emissions-reduction, clean fuel projects and climate mitigation — is absolutely necessary. The fee ensures that all of us, as end-users of fuel, have “skin in the game.”

The carbon fee would also be levied on coal-fired electricity imported into the state and on oil or natural gas used to heat homes.

Some industries — such as the Trans Alta power plant in Centralia, which is transitioning from coal to natural gas by 2025 — and energy-intensive or trade-sensitive industries are exempted.

Over time, the carbon fee would rise, creating a subtle market disincentive for petroleum products and an incentive for consumers or industries to opt for cleaner energy.

The initiative would generate more than \$1 billion a year in new state funds that would be invested as grants or other financing for energy projects. The projects to be funded would be authorized by a new board at the state Department of Commerce, which the governor would appoint and which would consult tribes.

Commerce would write a greenhouse-gas reduction plan to help judge whether a potential conservation or energy project can reduce emissions.

Four out-of-state oil groups in Washington, D.C., California and Texas have bankrolled the No on I-1631 political committee with most of the nearly \$22 million raised by the No on I-1631 campaign.

Environmental and labor groups are big backers of the Clean Air Clean Energy PAC, which has raised about \$8.5 million.

It’s hard to prove how well the measure will guarantee lower emissions. But neither the oil industry nor campaign spokeswoman Dana Bieber are believable when they pledge to work for a better carbon-reduction approach in the Legislature next year.

Bieber represents the coalition of oil and business allies that fought against every carbon-price idea put before the Legislature in recent times. If I-1631 is the wrong approach, the campaign should say what might be the right one.

Opponents also misrepresent why some industries are exempted in I-1631. Smart exemptions include biomass energy producers whose industry cycle requires them to plant new trees to offset emissions.

Becky Kelley, president of the Washington Environmental Council, and Jeff Johnson, president of the Washington State Labor Council, say I-1631 is actually an investment to spur new energy sources.

This investment is expected to create tens of thousands of jobs and help communities reduce their fossil fuel energy needs — as well as help communities adapt to climate impacts such as rising sea levels or job losses.

But to significantly reduce emissions is going to require a big shift in policy and practice — especially for our transportation system. The shift to cleaner fuels will also put some oil-refining jobs at risk of going away unless refiners shift to cleaner fuels.

But I-1631 allocates money — \$50 million initially — to address the impact of scaled-back oil production in communities that lose jobs. Johnson says justice requires that the transition to cleaner energy offers training help so laid-off workers get into clean energy jobs.

I-1631 critics such as former state auditor Brian Sonntag are focusing on what they call a lack of accountability in I-1631. But it is not clear the accountability is inadequate; legislators have oversight over all state programs.

And we think our Legislature is more apt to fix accountability flaws, if I-1631 passes, than the oil industry is going to help reduce

carbon emissions, if I-1631 fails.

In fact, the path to action on climate change has been rocky in Washington ever since emission-reduction targets were set in state law a decade ago. First the Great Recession led to a moratorium on regulatory actions.

Then Democratic Gov. Jay Inslee ran into opposition from Senate Republican lawmakers and business interests when he began efforts after 2013 to impose a cap on greenhouse gas emissions and to require more use of bio-fuel blends for vehicles.

Then Inslee joined environmentalists and labor groups to oppose a carbon tax initiative, which didn't do enough, they claimed, in 2016.

Two years later, Initiative 1631 is a second chance to get it right. Waiting a few more years to impose such a carbon fee is like putting off surgery for gangrene in one's ankle.

Waiting ensures only that the knife cuts later and higher on the leg.

10/11/18

KING 5 (Video)

Farmers disagree on value of Washington's carbon initiative

Alison Morrow

[Source](#)

10/11/18

KGW (TV)

Straight Talk with Laural Porter

[Source](#)

10/12/18

Redmond Reporter (Op-Ed)

I am going all in on I-1631

Mark Vossler

[Source](#)

As a physician, few things are more gut-wrenching than watching a patient struggle to breathe. But the growing pollution in our air means more of my patients and our children are fighting for breath from asthma, more elderly succumbing to heart failure, a rise in strokes, and many other health impacts. When you can't breathe nothing else matters.

This is why I am going all in on Initiative 1631. I am seeing firsthand the devastating effects of dirty air and I'm determined to fight back. This November, I invite you to join me as we take a significant step to clean up our air by passing this sensible and important initiative.

I-1631 would put a fee on our state's largest sources of pollution – primarily from the oil industry and utilities that still use coal. Analysts say this will bring down our emissions by 25 million tons of air pollution a year. At the same time, the fee will fund important projects that will protect communities, especially those already most impacted by carbon pollution. This makes clean energy more affordable for more people creating thousands of jobs across the state, ensuring these solutions are available to all.

The same polluters who would be asked to pay are, of course, fighting this initiative with all they've got. Five big oil companies have donated millions of dollars to the No campaign's funding. They are spending millions in our state to scare voters and mislead them about the facts. You'll see a lot of their ads in the coming weeks but don't be fooled, these are from out-of-state oil companies who don't share our values and just want to protect their profits at the expense of our health. I've read the initiative and as a health professional, this is a sensible solution to tackle a problem that continues to make us sick and will make us even sicker in the future if we fail to act now.

Initiative 1631, the clean air and clean energy initiative, has broad and deep support. A remarkable coalition that includes businesses large and small, tribal nations, communities of color, environmental and clean energy advocates, labor unions, medical

professionals, and many others has come together to craft a sensible first-step solution that will hold our state's largest polluters accountable. The fact that so many amazing diverse groups are ready to stand up for their communities and face off with big oil is inspiring to me and tells me we are on the right track. This measure and the many groups and individuals supporting it represent all of Washington and our commitment to clean air, clean water, and a healthy place to live.

I live and work in Kirkland and seeing so many of my neighbors, friends, and colleagues excited about this initiative has made me incredibly proud to be a part of this community. I hope you will join me in taking this important step. Our health depends on it.

10/12/18

The Daily News

PUD Commissioner candidates talk I-1631, wind farms

Alex Bruell

[Source](#)

In the race for Cowlitz County PUD's District 2 Commissioner, both Duane Dagleish and Ned Piper have painted themselves as advocates for customers.

"I think it's good that we're both arguing the same thing, because that's primary to the commissioners job," Piper said Wednesday. "All I can say is I've got 24 years of experience in that role."

Piper recounted an instruction he once gave a PUD worker who was receiving requests for Piper's phone number: "I want people to have my cell number, my home number, my email address, because that's my job, to try to help people with their problems and advocate for them," Piper said.

Dagleish said his role on the PUD's Electrical Rates Advisory Committee, a voluntary board he's been a member of for the six years it has existed, has put him in constant contact with customer issues and the PUD's budgeting — two priorities for the commissioner position.

"I know budgets, and I know contracts," Dagleish said Tuesday. "And most of the things that the commissioners do at the PUD are budgets and contracts."

The candidates have agreed on many issues facing the PUD in public forums and debates: they're both skeptical of Initiative 1631, eager for investments by major industrial plants in the county, and cautiously open to contracting for power outside of the Bonneville Power Administration, where the PUD buys most of its power. But they have locked horns on some issues.

Wind farms

Piper said he's optimistic about White Creek and Harvest Wind, two wind farms the PUD built in southern Washington after I-937 passed in 2006 to comply with the initiative's green energy requirements. The wind farms cost the PUD about \$11.6 million per year and generate about \$4 million per year in revenue, PUD communications manager Alice Dietz said

Piper said in 2016 that the PUD "probably should not have built Harvest Wind," but he said Wednesday that he's reconsidered that position.

"At the time, they were very sound investments," Piper said. "And I believe that over time, we will discover that they were incredible investments. Because when the bonds are paid off, the wind farms will still be producing. The wind is free, so the power source is free. The only cost will be operations and maintenance."

Piper said it's hard to tell when the county will break even on the turbines. But they've pulled double duty by fulfilling the law and allowing the PUD to prepare for the county's growth, he said.

Dagleish said that "years will tell" if the wind farms prove to be solid investments.

"Future years will tell us whether they will or not," he said. "Right now they're not. The PUD is paying the price. ... The first (farm) they built was fine. The second one, they should have asked the people for their opinion before they jumped in and put our PUD in debt by \$3 million." Dagleish said he understands why the PUD invested in the turbines — they were an appetizing investment, independent from Bonneville — but he said the PUD should have run the idea by ratepayers first.

Dalgleish and Piper are both against Washington's proposed carbon fee initiative, but they're not completely against the idea of a carbon tax.

Dalgleish questioned the legislators' decision to not include members of the electricity or utility district industries on the 15-member board, which the initiative would create to oversee money raised from the fee.

"We're not represented," Dalgleish said. "In two years, they're going to get over \$2 billion worth of monies and a blank check, as far as I'm concerned. How do they know what to give us?"

"Washington state and our utility are virtually carbon-free, once we get rid of the coal plant in Centralia," Piper said. "It just seems to me to be overkill to impose a carbon tax on utilities or industries."

The PUD buys more than 90 percent of its wholesale power from the Bonneville Power Administration, according to its website. (The rest comes from the PUD's own dam on the Lewis River.)

But in addition to its hydroelectric dams, Bonneville also sells power from the Columbia Generating Station (a Richland-area nuclear plant) and makes miscellaneous energy purchases on the open market. So the power that Cowlitz' and other county's PUDs buy from Bonneville is not entirely hydroelectric, and it's difficult to determine the exact breakdown of Bonneville's energy sources.

The Cowlitz PUD's fuel source mix is about 82 percent hydroelectric, 9 percent nuclear, 4 percent coal, 3 percent wind, 1.5 percent natural gas, and a tiny amount of other sources, per its website.

This mix of energy sources — along with the contentious debate around whether hydroelectric power should be treated as "green" — complicates the initiative's effects on the PUD.

"They have to tax us because we don't know what power we're buying," Dalgleish said. "But they don't know how much they're going to tax us."

10/12/18

KUOW

Will Washington lead the nation on a carbon tax this November?

Angela King & Jason Pagano

[Source](#)

Voter support for a state carbon emissions fee or tax appears to be growing.

A new Elway Poll shows 50 percent of Washington voters now back the carbon tax initiative I-1631 on the November ballot. Thirty-six percent opposed it and 14 percent are still undecided.

Initiatives typically need more support than that at this point to survive the negative onslaught during the last few weeks of the campaign.

Q13 political analyst C.R. Douglas joined KUOW's Angela King to discuss the initiative's prospects.

King: On Tuesday Bill Gates announced he's throwing his support behind I-1631. How big a deal is this endorsement?

Douglas: Well it's a big get. I mean you'd rather have Bill Gates and his money than not — but it doesn't ensure victory. There are plenty of things he's endorsed or given money to that haven't gone on to win. What's interesting I think is the method of the announcement. It was the simplest, least-fanfare thing imaginable: a blog post. There was no big press conference. And I think that was deliberate. You have to kind of finesse and not overplay these big mega-donors. The optics aren't great for having a billionaire get up and say, 'Hey you, raise your taxes.'

So how much would this measure cost the average household?

Opponents say it would be about \$35 extra a month per household by 2020 in terms of gas costs, heating bills, that kind of thing. Supporters say no, it would be more like \$10 to \$15 per month.

Why the difference?

Well, the accounting on this kind of thing is a little bit hard to calculate. When you tax an oil company or a gas company, how much of that cost do they absorb and how much do they pass it on to consumers in the form of higher gas prices, all the rest? Opponents say, 'Hey, this will all be flowed to the consumer.' Supporters say, 'No, in a big, complex, competitive economy you're going to have some companies that decide to absorb at least some of the costs so that the burden will be shared.'

If Washington passes this we'd be the first state with such a carbon emissions fee or tax.

Absolutely. And you will see it being brought up in other states just like the pot initiative.

So there was a recent Crosscut / Elway Poll that found Republican Dino Rossi has a 10-point lead over Democrat Kim Schrier in the 8th Congressional District. Do carbon emissions factor into people's vote there?

That poll is a dramatic change from what the polls had shown up to then, which is basically an even race. The determinant is clearly the Kavanaugh hearings. According to this poll, that's when things really shifted in his favor. And surprisingly it's women who were the real movers who have gone from Schrier to Rossi, according to that poll.

So this will settle a little bit. But what it shows is that there clearly has been a backlash to the Kavanaugh hearings and how he was treated by Democrats and that backlash is pronounced in this race among women.

10/12/18

News Talk (Radio)

Surprise! 17 WA Labor Unions Join to Oppose I-1631

John McKay

[Source](#)

10/12/18

USA Today (Op-Ed)

States can lead the way on climate change policy as Trump rolls back protections

Abigail Dillen

[Source](#)

The world's leading panel of climate experts sounded the alarm this week that we are running out of time to get rising temperatures under control. Its latest report calls for "rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented" steps to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, from worsening wildfires and extreme drought to rising sea levels and more powerful storms. It also reminds us what is at stake if we fail to act: our health, our food and water security, our environment and our economy.

These risks are no longer hypothetical. Across the country, we are already seeing the devastating impacts of extreme weather fueled by climate change. As the Carolinas deal with the aftermath of catastrophic flooding from Hurricane Florence and Florida deals with Hurricane Michael, wildfires across the West have burned an area larger than the state of Maryland.

Meanwhile, the Trump administration is ignoring the threat of climate change and continuing its assault on critical protections of our air, water, land and wildlife. With a president determined to prop up the fossil fuel industry at the expense of public health and the environment, it is easy to feel discouraged.

But there is reason for hope.

States are picking up the federal government's slack

In the absence of leadership in Washington, D.C., states are stepping up to the plate. They are building powerful and diverse

coalitions that center the voices of those most directly impacted by pollution. They are standing by our international climate commitments, despite President Trump's pledge to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. And they are enacting smart policies that move us towards a clean energy future, even as the Trump administration tries to turn back the clock.

California recently passed SB 100, committing the state to 100 percent clean energy by 2045.

This is no small feat for the fifth largest economy in the world, and one of the nation's largest oil producing states. California is already home to half a million clean energy jobs, and this move accelerates the state's momentum towards a carbon-free grid. With SB 100, California is proving that a healthy environment and a thriving economy can — and must — go hand-in-hand.

California follows Hawaii, which passed a similar measure in 2015 to transition to 100 percent renewable energy by 2045. And in Massachusetts, the state Senate recently passed a bill to power the state with 100 percent renewable energy by 2047. As clean energy becomes increasingly affordable, these targets are within our reach.

Inclusivity is the key to smart climate policy

This November, voters in Washington state will consider a ballot initiative that would cement the state's leadership on climate change. Initiative 1631 would impose a modest fee on the state's largest climate polluters, generating billions in revenue for clean energy infrastructure, clean transportation options, job training and the local communities most impacted by pollution. The initiative would become the first-of-its-kind to be enacted directly by voters.

Initiative 1631 was crafted through an inclusive process that brought stakeholders together from more than 250 organizations. It is backed by tribal nations, groups representing communities of color, health professionals, businesses, scientists, faith groups and clean energy advocates. The result is a thoughtful approach that will ensure a smooth — and just — transition to clean energy.

Both SB 100 and Initiative 1631 demonstrate how inclusivity and collaboration lead to smart climate policy that benefits all of us. They also underscore the critical role of states in solving our climate crisis, especially at a time when politicians in D.C. are letting us down

At Earthjustice, we're fighting the Trump administration's attempts to gut environmental protections with more than 100 lawsuits filed in federal court — many of which attempt to protect communities and the planet from pollution caused by fossil fuels. We're working to ensure that our transition to clean energy advances equity and justice for those communities impacted most by climate change. And we're partnering with states on the frontlines of our climate fight that are setting an example for the country and the world.

Even in the Trump era, progress is possible on climate change — and states must continue to lead the way.

10/12/18

National Catholic Reporter

Washington bishops urge voters to carefully weigh clean air initiative

Catholic News Service

[Source](#)

SEATTLE — The five Catholic bishops of Washington state have offered voters a "framework" by which to consider a Nov. 6 ballot initiative that would, among other measures, put a price on carbon emissions.

Citing the teaching of the popes of the last half-century — from Blessed Paul VI through Pope Francis — the bishops said in an Oct. 4 statement that their concern focused on the impact of climate change on the world's poorest and most vulnerable people.

Titled "Catholic Principles and Environmental Policy," the statement was released on the feast of St. Francis of Assisi, patron saint of the environment.

The bishops stated they remained neutral on Initiative 1631 as Washingtonians prepared to vote.

The measure, also known as the Clean Air Clean Energy Initiative, was developed as an effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by requiring the state to invest in clean air and water and clean energy, support forests and "healthy communities." It would impose a fee on large carbon emitters based on the amount of pollution they release.

BPA_HCOR_00140049

The bishops offered several points for voters to consider before going to the polls.

They urged people to weigh how any effort to impact climate change "should respect human life and dignity, especially that of the poorest and most vulnerable among us."

Along with human dignity, they said, "local communities, especially low-income residents whose voice is not often heard, should have a voice in shaping the efforts to reduce carbon emissions."

Finally, the bishops called for "workers to be supported in dealing with the negative effects on the workforce resulting from a shift away from fossil fuels by receiving assistance to mitigate impacts on their livelihoods and families."

Noting that the initiative would significantly affect Washington state, the bishops said that applying Catholic teaching to the ballot measure "is not a cut and dried exercise and calls for prayerful consideration."

"We believe that wise action to address climate change is necessary to protect the common good for present and future generations. Beyond the initiative, we urge every person in Washington state to seek effective ways in our personal lives, and in our businesses and industries to promote the common good and care for God's creation," the statement concluded.

Signing the statement were Archbishop Peter Sartain and Auxiliary Bishops Eusebio Elizondo and Daniel Mueggenborg of Seattle, Bishop Thomas Daly of Spokane, and Bishop Joseph Tyson of Yakima.

The Washington initiative is among the latest being undertaken by individual states to reduce carbon pollution as the Environmental Protection Agency has introduced plans to roll back regulations on industry, citing the high cost of implementing some measures and executive branch overreach during Barack Obama's administration.

10/12/18

Columbia SPIA (Report)

A Carbon Tax Under Real World Constraints: Examining Concerns With Washington's Initiative 1631

Noah Kaufman

[Source](#)

###

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "NO on 1631 Daily Clips" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to newsclips-

@votenoon1631.com.