

**From:** Kai N. Puhrmann [kpuhrmanns@blackfoot.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 30, 2009 2:15 PM  
**To:** 'Kai N. Puhrmann'; Benjamin Schmidt; Mamie Colburn; Ellen Leahy; Jim Carlson; Shannon Therriault; Greg Oliver  
**Cc:** jcurtiss@co.missoula.mt.us; bcarey@co.missoula.mt.us; mlandquist@co.missoula.mt.us; Annie Puhrmann; Don & Carolyn Hanson; Forrest Ebbs; Holly Oxford; 'Hobbs'; Jack & Karen; Kathy & Dale Poling; 'Kyle Hanson'; LWeinberger@blackfoot.net; Tim and Linda Wolfe; Tim Wolfe; 'Matthew Curtis'; 'JMS'  
**Subject:** Meeting Minutes

Regarding this portion of the minutes from the March 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting (please see attached):

*“5. Article Presentation: Bert Chessin. “Surprise – Economists agree!” by Eric Pooley. Feb. 11, 2009. Bert presented an article from Slate.com on the economic impacts of global climate change. The article states that many economists have evaluated the possible economic impacts of climate change and come to some agreements. The article states that there is an emerging economic consensus that the cost of climate inaction will exceed the cost of climate action.*

*There was debate between council members that even if we took drastic actions, there may or may not be climate changes that we can stop. The article addresses how expensive action or inaction could be. Environmental Defense estimates during 2010-2030 cost impact of global warming could be 70-80 billion dollars a year, approximately 1 % of GDP (Gross Domestic Product). They estimate that inaction could increase those figures to up to 20% of GDP. Heated debate about global climate change and whether it has solutions or not ensued.”*

**The magazine article that is being presented to the board is from Slate.com, which is a (self admitted) liberal entertainment online periodical, owned by the Washington Post, that doesn't even have subscriptions. Meaning it is an online blog. What kind of credible scientific research can an online blog actually come up with?? This is what the board members are using as source material??? That is not only irresponsible, but downright dangerous! Finally, how does the board think that they are going to make a global difference in 'global warming' by having some woodstove restrictions? Maybe no one has told these people that the population of our entire state is comparable to that of the city of Austin, TX???? If they want to worry about global issues, how about getting China to stop sending over poisoned food and toys, or staunching the flow of illegal aliens (now infected with the swine flu, according to Slate.com), and then worry about woodstoves. Also, why would they need to worry about global warming costing about the same as 1% of our GDP when our Presidents proposed deficit budget equals 40% of our GDP for the next ten years? P.S. You can't even be admitted to the European Union with a deficit ratio of more than 25% of your countries GDP. So Haiti could qualify, but the US couldn't...**

Kai Puhrmann