

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2019

Original Co-Signatories Include (full list on reverse):

- 4 Former Chairs of the Federal Reserve (All)**
 - 27 Nobel Laureate Economists**
 - 15 Former Chairs of the Council of Economic Advisers**
 - 2 Former Secretaries of the U.S. Department of Treasury**
-

Economists' Statement on Carbon Dividends

Global climate change is a serious problem calling for immediate national action. Guided by sound economic principles, we are united in the following policy recommendations.

I. A carbon tax offers the most cost-effective lever to reduce carbon emissions at the scale and speed that is necessary. By correcting a well-known market failure, a carbon tax will send a powerful price signal that harnesses the invisible hand of the marketplace to steer economic actors towards a low-carbon future.

II. A carbon tax should increase every year until emissions reductions goals are met and be revenue neutral to avoid debates over the size of government. A consistently rising carbon price will encourage technological innovation and large-scale infrastructure development. It will also accelerate the diffusion of carbon-efficient goods and services.

III. A sufficiently robust and gradually rising carbon tax will replace the need

for various carbon regulations that are less efficient. Substituting a price signal for cumbersome regulations will promote economic growth and provide the regulatory certainty companies need for long-term investment in clean-energy alternatives.

IV. To prevent carbon leakage and to protect U.S. competitiveness, a border carbon adjustment system should be established. This system would enhance the competitiveness of American firms that are more energy-efficient than their global competitors. It would also create an incentive for other nations to adopt similar carbon pricing.

V. To maximize the fairness and political viability of a rising carbon tax, all the revenue should be returned directly to U.S. citizens through equal lump-sum rebates. The majority of American families, including the most vulnerable, will benefit financially by receiving more in "carbon dividends" than they pay in increased energy prices.

Original Co-Signatories

George Akerlof
Nobel Laureate Economist

Bengt Holmström
Nobel Laureate Economist

Alvin Roth
Nobel Laureate Economist

Robert Aumann
Nobel Laureate Economist

Glenn Hubbard
Former Chair of CEA

Thomas Sargent
Nobel Laureate Economist

Martin Baily
Former Chair of CEA

Daniel Kahneman
Nobel Laureate Economist

Myron Scholes
Nobel Laureate Economist

Ben Bernanke
Former Chair of Federal Reserve
Former Chair of CEA

Alan Krueger
Former Chair of CEA

Amartya Sen
Nobel Laureate Economist

Michael Boskin
Former Chair of CEA

Finn Kydland
Nobel Laureate Economist

William Sharpe
Nobel Laureate Economist

Angus Deaton
Nobel Laureate Economist

Edward Lazear
Former Chair of CEA

Robert Shiller
Nobel Laureate Economist

Peter Diamond
Nobel Laureate Economist

Robert Lucas
Nobel Laureate Economist

George Shultz
Former U.S. Treasury Secretary

Robert Engle
Nobel Laureate Economist

N. Gregory Mankiw
Former Chair of CEA

Christopher Sims
Nobel Laureate Economist

Eugene Fama
Nobel Laureate Economist

Eric Maskin
Nobel Laureate Economist

Robert Solow
Nobel Laureate Economist

Martin Feldstein
Former Chair of CEA

Daniel McFadden
Nobel Laureate Economist

Michael Spence
Nobel Laureate Economist

Jason Furman
Former Chair of CEA

Robert Merton
Nobel Laureate Economist

Lawrence Summers
Former U.S. Treasury Secretary

Alan Greenspan
Former Chair of Federal Reserve
Former Chair of CEA

Roger Myerson
Nobel Laureate Economist

Richard Thaler
Nobel Laureate Economist

Austan Goolsbee
Former Chair of CEA

Edmund Phelps
Nobel Laureate Economist

Laura Tyson
Former Chair of CEA

Lars Peter Hansen
Nobel Laureate Economist

Christina Romer
Former Chair of CEA

Paul Volcker
Former Chair of Federal Reserve

Oliver Hart
Nobel Laureate Economist

Harvey Rosen
Former Chair of CEA

Janet Yellen
Former Chair of Federal Reserve
Former Chair of CEA

**CLIMATE
LEADERSHIP
COUNCIL**

Thank you for considering this Local Control for Livestock siting advisory resolution. I'm Tommy Enright – the author of the resolution- and I have a farm in the Town of Amherst in Portage County.

In June, this resolution passed the Portage County Board by a vote of 21-2. Prior to that, it unanimously passed through Portage County's Groundwater Citizens Advisory Committee, unanimously passed Planning and Zoning, and passed the Land & Water committee by a vote of 4-1.

To be clear, advisory resolutions do not change laws. Nor is this an ordinance. Advisory resolutions have a purpose of informing legislators about public opinion.

I also want to be clear that this not an anti-farming resolution. As a farmer myself (including livestock), I view farmers as stewards of the land, and acknowledge that there are responsible and conservation-minded farmers at all scales of production. Furthermore, passage of this resolution would not affect any existing CAFOs in the county- we're not trying to shut anyone down or run anyone out of business.

This resolution addresses ATCP 51, the regulation that oversees livestock siting. ATCP51 preempts local control, meaning that it's incredibly difficult for a county, town, or municipality to contest the placement of a concentrated livestock feeding operation, even if the local community opposes it. Representatives from the DNR have said – on record- that when ATCP 51 was written, they didn't anticipate 10,000-26,000 thousand animal operations. 1000 seemed huge at the time.

The second part of the resolution addresses recommendations for updates to ATCP 51 by a state technical committee. The committee has met every 4 years since 2010, but so far none of its recommendations have been considered. Their most recent recommendations were made in Spring 2019, and for the first time, DATCP is holding public hearings about the proposed revisions to ATCP 51, despite political pressure to once again ignore them.

State Assembly Representative Katrina Shankland, who has expressed support for this resolution and attended two committee meetings and the Portage County Board meeting about this resolution, has confirmed with the state's nonpartisan

Legislative Council attorneys that passing this resolution places no legal liability upon the county.

I believe that citizens know what's best for their own communities. From 2011-2016, Wisconsin lawmakers passed more than 162 measures that represent unfunded mandates and restrictions on the decision-making power of local governments, according to a May 16, 2016 memo released by the nonpartisan Legislative Fiscal Bureau. In fact, last May, the state's Joint Finance Committee blocked local control of quarries, ensuring that local governments won't be allowed to restrict blasting or set air and water quality standards beyond state regulations.

From 2000-2017 number of 0-50 cow dairies in the US dropped by about 75%, 50-99 cow dairies dropped by over 50%, and 100-199 cow dairies dropped by over 40%. In fact, the only dairies that saw a rise in numbers were those from 1000-1999, which saw an increase of about 50% and dairies over 2000 cows, which saw an over-250% increase.

WI certainly reflects this trend across the board in livestock production. Currently, an out of state company is trying to put a 26000-hog operation in Burnett County, which will produce over 8 million gallons of manure annually. For those of us in Portage County where 24% of wells test high for nitrates, this should be enough to give anyone pause. Similar stories are happening or have happened across the state and with more frequency. Wisconsin has a very diverse geology and hydrology, and a "one size fits all" approach like ATCP 51 does not adequately address vulnerable areas.

To give a more holistic picture, let's look at the economic impact.

In a 2000 study of 1,106 rural communities, economic growth rates in communities with traditional-sized farms were 55% higher than in those with large animal feeding operations. This is because smaller farms make nearly 95% of their expenditures locally, while larger operations spend less than 20% locally. Having many farms of various sizes has a huge impact on the local economy and provides a livelihood for many hardworking people. It's not just the farmers who will be out of work if we continue down the path of farm consolidation and corporate-owned farms.

What I'm really trying to get at, and what I'd like to reiterate, is that as citizens of Marathon County, you know what's best for your communities. My hope is that counties across the state will adopt this advisory resolution, sending a message that Wisconsin towns and counties should have control over what's happening in their own backyards. This is an opportunity for Marathon County to take the lead on this issue, and I hope you'll join me in supporting it.

Tommy Enright
4977 Keener Rd.
Amherst, WI 54406
715-513-0460
Tommy.enright@gmail.com

RESOLUTION NO. _____

TO: THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE _____ COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RE: RESOLUTION SUPPORTING LOCAL CONTROL FOR LIVESTOCK SITING

WHEREAS, the number of Concentrated Livestock Feeding Operations (CAFOs) in Wisconsin is increasing (between 2005 and 2016, the number of CAFOs nearly doubled - from 146 to 295); and

WHEREAS, State law preempts local governments from regulating CAFOs more stringently than required the Livestock Facility Siting Law (ATCP 51), and

WHEREAS, opportunity for stronger local siting standards based on “reasonable and scientifically defensible findings of fact” that “clearly show that the standards are needed to protect the public health or safety.” remains very limited; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) issues water pollution discharge permits to CAFOs, and more stringent local regulation of issues related to water quality may also prove difficult; and

WHEREAS, the unique geographic features throughout Wisconsin make it necessary to assess the environmental impacts of CAFO's on a county-by-county basis; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Revenue adjusted downward a Kewaunee County landowner's property taxes because of the property's proximity to a large CAFO and in 2016 the Department of Revenue did the same for a property in Green County; and

WHEREAS, in addition to affecting landowners, this also impacts local governments, which are seeing a deterioration of their property tax base because existing state siting standards are insufficient to protect neighboring properties; and

WHEREAS, per state statute 93.90(2)(a) Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) shall appoint a Technical Committee to review ATCP 51 and make recommendations at least every four years; and

WHEREAS, DATCP convened the first Technical Committees in 2010, 2014, and 2018 but has made no changes to ATCP 51 despite the committee's work or summary reports; and

WHEREAS, state statute 93.90 fails to provide guidance for implementation of the Technical Committee's recommendations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that _____ County Board of Supervisors recognizes the authority of ATCP 51 to set statewide, minimum standards and procedures for CAFOs but

supports lifting the preemption of local control in ATCP 51 and allowing local governments to pass more stringent standards and procedures that are based on reasonable and scientifically defensible findings of fact that clearly show that the standards are needed to protect surface water and groundwater, air quality, and public health or safety without seeking DATCP or DNR approval; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that _____ County Board of Supervisors urges the legislature to amend the statute to require that the findings of the Technical Committee must be presented in writing to the Dept of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP), and that the Board of DATCP must present a scope statement to the Wisconsin Secretary of Agriculture within 90 days, and if DATCP fails to take action on the scope statement within 6 months, the scope statement must be sent to the Joint Committee for Review of Administrative Rules and scheduled for a public hearing; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the _____ County Clerk is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Counties Association, the Wisconsin Towns Association, the Wisconsin League of Municipalities, all members of the state legislature, and to each Wisconsin County.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 201_

Respectfully submitted,