



CCL National Conference Call

Saturday, March 5th, 2011

Group Meetings from 9:45 AM – 12:15 PM Pacific

Call from 10:00 AM – 11:15 AM Pacific (1:00 PM EST)

Call in number: 1-866-642-1665 pass code 440699#

Guest Speaker Tom Bowman



Tom Bowman is one of the premier interpreters of global change, climate and energy science, and green business strategies. He is an advisor, strategist, communicator, and producer. Through his work with the National Academy of Sciences, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, and energy companies across the country, Tom discovered an urgent need to improve science communication and employ its results to make better, more sustainable decisions. He founded Bowman Global Change to help organizations achieve these goals.

Tom has written about climate change and communication priorities in the academic and popular press; contributed to NOAA's *Essential Principals of Climate Literacy* and NOAA/CORE *Public Ocean Literacy* publications; and hosted meetings of experts in climate science, social science, economics, ethics, and communication with the support of NOAA and the CDC.

Actions:

- 1) Practice the laser talk.
- 2) **U.S. volunteers:** Schedule meetings with members of Congress CCL lobby day, Tuesday, June 21 (Senate in morning, House in afternoon).
Canadian volunteers: Schedule meetings with World Bank representative for CCL lobby day, Tuesday, June 21.
- 3) Write letters to the editor connecting instability in Middle East to the need to move away from fossil fuels and toward clean energy made in North America.

CCL LASER TALK MARCH 2011

Q&A on economics of carbon fee and dividend

Q. How much would CCL's proposal raise the price of gas at the pump?

A. A fee of \$15 per ton of CO₂ would add 13 cents a gallon to the price of gas. If the fee goes up \$10 per ton each year, it would take 10 years to raise the price of gas by \$1 a gallon, plenty of time for car manufacturers and consumers to make the adjustment to more fuel-efficient vehicles¹.

Q. How much would people get back from your carbon fee?

A. A fee of \$15 per ton of CO₂, collected in 2012, would raise \$81.3 billion. Dividing by an estimated 316.3 million Americans in 2012, each individual would receive \$257. In 10 years, they would each receive \$1,391¹.

Q. How would the poor be affected by this carbon fee?

A. The poor would actually come out ahead. The poorest 20% of Americans account for only 9% of carbon consumption, while the richest 20% account for 32%. Doing the math, with our proposal the poorest 20% would get back \$141 more than they paid in the first year; more than double their costs from the fee².

Q. What about regional differences, the fact that some areas will be harder hit by a fee on carbon than others?

A. A study from the American Enterprise Institute calculated the effect of a \$15 per ton carbon tax and found that the biggest differences between regions would amount to 0.37 percent of income. For a household making \$50,000, this would amount to a difference of \$185 between the most affected and least affected areas. The average differences would be much less. The reason this figure is so low because the impact of energy costs is reflected in all goods and services purchased by consumers, not just utilities. These costs are more evenly distributed throughout the nation³.

Q. What would the hardest-hit industries be, and how much would the price of their products rise?

A. Coal, oil and gas would be the hardest hit, but that's the point. The next-hardest hit industry would be air transportation, with industry price rises of 1.8% (2.2% for consumers) in the first year⁴.

Q. What percentage of households would break even or end up ahead with your carbon tax?

A. Two thirds of households would break even or end up ahead with our proposal⁵. Investments in energy efficiency would pay off for families, as they would be able to keep more of the carbon dividend⁵.

Q. Do renewables really create more jobs than traditional fossil fuels?

A. As early as 2008, the wind sector already employed more people than the coal mining industry⁶ even though in 2009 coal accounted for 44.5% of electricity generation while wind produced only 1.9%⁷. In addition, job creation for oil and gas industries is 0.8 jobs for each \$1 million of output. For coal, the figure is 1.9 jobs per \$1 million of output. This compares with 4.6 jobs for wind and 5.4 jobs for solar⁶.

Q. Will this renewable job advantage continue once the initial construction phase is over?

A. If wind makes up 20% of national domestic energy needs by 2030, conservative estimates are that over 500,000 jobs would be generated and “supported”⁸. The entire renewable energy and energy efficiency sectors combined could sustain over 37 million jobs by 2030⁶.

Q. Why should we move on this if China isn't?

A: China is moving. In 2009, China committed \$34.6 billion to clean energy investment compared to \$18.6 billion in the U.S. Roughly 4% of generating capacity in both the US and China comes from renewables, but with twice the new investment in clean energy, China is on track to be the **world** leader in clean energy investment, manufacturing, and installed capacity, within **one to two years**⁶.

References

1. Charles Komanoff. “4-sector National Carbon Tax Model.” The Carbon Tax Center, 2011. URL: http://www.komanoff.net/fossil/CTC_Carbon_Tax_Model.xls
2. “Managing Impacts.” The Carbon Tax Center, 2010. URL: <http://www.carbontax.org/issues/softening-the-impact-of-carbon-taxes/> Last accessed: 2/14/11.
3. Hassett, Kevin A; Mathur, Aparna; Metcalf, Gilbert , The Incidence of a U.S. Carbon Tax: a Lifetime and Regional Analysis. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. January 2008. URL: http://www.aei.org/docLib/20080201_USCarbonTax.pdf
4. Gilbert E. Metcalf. "Green Employment Tax Swap: Using a Carbon Tax to Finance Payroll Tax Relief" The Brookings Institution and the World Resources Institute, 2007. URL: <http://www.wri.org/publication/green-employment-tax-swap>
5. Boyce, James K; Riddle, Matthew E. “Clear Economics: State-Level Impacts of the Carbon Limits and Energy for America's Renewal Act on Family Incomes and Jobs.” Political Economy Research Institute, 2010. URL: http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/other_publication_types/green_economics/CLEAR_Economics.pdf
6. Joseph Robertson. “Building a Green Economy”. The Citizens Climate Lobby, 2010. URL: <http://citizensclimatelobby.org/node/457>

March Action: Letter to the Editor

Middle East instability points to need to wean U.S. and Canada off fossil fuels

With uprisings in the Middle East now spreading to oil-exporting countries like Libya, attention is once again focused on U.S. dependency on foreign oil. Many worry that price spikes at the gas pump will deliver a shock to the economy.

With such stories dominating the news, it presents an opportunity for letters to the editor. If three letters are submitted from your group, one of them should stand a good chance of being published.

Open your letter with a reference to news stories about the tumultuous events occurring in the Middle East and worries about the U.S. oil supply being affected.

Talking points (use some, not all):

- It's time for the U.S. and Canada to get serious about energy independence by transitioning off fossil fuels and on to clean energy.
- The U.S. expends hundreds of billions of dollars on our military to secure the flow of oil from the Middle East, a cost never factored into the price at the pump.
- Obama talked about having a million electric vehicles on the road by 2015. Meanwhile China is committing to putting a million electric vehicles on the road every year.
- Events in the Middle East should not be used as an excuse to pump more crude from Canada's tar sands, as this would be environmentally devastating and contribute further to climate change.
- One of the reasons we're seeing more unrest in the world is because food prices are soaring because of droughts and floods that will become more severe and frequent as the Earth heats up. The warming of the planet, scientists tell us, is directly related to the burning of fossil fuels.
- We can secure our energy independence AND create millions of new jobs by giving investors the incentive to put capital into clean energy.
- Putting a price on carbon will create the incentive to drive investments in clean energy.
- A direct fee on carbon-based fuels, increasing gradually over time, would send the predictable price signal needed to speed the transition to clean energy.
- Returning revenue from the carbon fee to families will shield households from the economic impact of rising energy costs associated with the carbon fee.

Wrap your letter up with a strong conclusion or call to action. Follow your newspapers instructions for letter submission (word length, including address and phone number).

If a letter gets published, be sure the offices of your senators and members of the House receive copies along with a note asking them to support carbon fee and dividend legislation.