

AFW-3 Comments
Recommendation 41
Ethanol production

We're too small to significantly affect this. Ethanol has been a bust so far. Wait for cellulosic ethanol to develop.

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

ethanol is inefficient. Why has the state eliminated its E85 fleet?

Cannot support unless we know the impact on price of food. It is already significant on corn and as a result on beef.

There should be a cost/benefit analysis required. The benefits do not justify the costs using sound science. More taxes, regulations and red tape is not what will help Montana.

Make sure to plan in a sustainable manner!

with all this corn and grain going for ethanol ,what will we eat

I'm not convinced that ethanol is a net gain in energy efficiency.
Concerns about ethanol.

The state should not be funding this research. It should be conducted at the federal level or by the private sector.

Ethanol is of questionable applicability to Montana.

not in favor of subsidizing conventional ethanol, in favor of developing cellulosic ethanol

From what I've been reading, ethanol production increases GHG emissions.

Ethanol is not going to help. It has a terrible Net energy ratio.

Move away from food crop-based biofuels. Include butanol pilot production programs.

Emphasis here will be on starch based technologies, which have a lower Energy Returned on Energy Invested than cellulosic; ratio of cellulosic to starch should be much higher to focus development in this direction.

First look at what municipalities are throwing away right now that they could be using for energy or recycling... or reducing to begin with. More methods of procuring energy without efficiency just throwing money away.

The carbon footprint of ethanol must be considered. Corn based ethanol results in overall increases in carbon emissions. Any fuel that is supported must have lower life-cycle carbon emissions than traditional fuels.

This is clearly in the federal arena. Let's stop pretending that little ol' Montana can afford to lead the nation. We'll all go broke absent a level playing field (federal rules).

Where does the money come from?

Research has been occurring for at least decades. Remove the subsidies that discourage free market solutions.

I don't like the trade-offs of ethanol compared to the benefits. Doesn't seem like a good solution. Land should be used to grow food.

Using croplands to produce "fuels" is inefficient and costly. Farming requires extensive use of fertilizers whose runoff pollutes rivers, lakes and oceans; and, in addition, serves to drive up the price of foods, e.g. corn feed animals.

This may be very big in the future. Montana has all the ingredients as well as the economic need. I would like to see Montana step to the forefront on this.

Not until biodiesel production is shown to have a significantly smaller ecological footprint. ethanol is not sustainable as currently produced and should be stopped. Food production is and will be far more important a strategy than gasoline additives.

Cellulosic has to drive the Ethanol.

I don't believe ethanol is the answer and don't believe we should be encouraging its production. R&D may be beneficial in this area but we are 25 years out in cellulosic research and this dry state can-not compete with high rainfall states. A good option is forest based material that should be used before it burns in fires.

The proportions of starch vs. cellulosic ethanol should be reversed. Emphasize cellulosic and phase out starch-based.

When they are economically feasible. This would be a lot better than using up food crops!

Individuals can only do so much with this issue, we need strong and numerous government action of many forms and formats...

Until it takes less than the energy in 1 gallon of petroleum to create 1 gallon of ethanol (and under our current plans and procedures, it DOES NOT), then why in the world would anyone knowledgeable of this fact support the production of ethanol for fuel???

Specialized equipment to collect and "efficiently" bundle and transport forestry residues costs hundreds of thousands of dollars. None exist in Montana. Pilot projects and demonstrations will be costly-where will the incentive money come from?

Bad idea.

Look to the UN-intended consequences. Let the market do its job. Like most government involvement in an issue, it is well intentioned, but will ultimately make the situation more cumbersome and expensive.

Again, mostly a welfare program for Big Ag and a diversion from real solutions.

Montana should be leading the way in research on small diameter wood/ thinning wood/ etc. as use in biomass fuel sources.

When we run out of food maybe we can drink the ethanol.

I support ethanol production. Again, the complete process from start to finish needs to be considered.

NOT CORN!!!!

The ethanol boondoggle is already causing loss of farmland AND increases in food prices. There are indications that this none sense is already affecting nutrition levels adversely in developing countries which have bought into this " Progressive boutique technology".

Do not create incentives for turning florest "residue" into ethanol. Leave the residue in the forest to complete the forest regeneration cycle. Next you'll be wanting to fertilize the forests to make up for the poorer soils that result from mining biomass in the forests.

Ethanol should not come from food crops! Do not support the creation of more commercial incentives to log public forests!

This makes more sense than the previous proposal

Stimulating ethanol production needs to be done cautiously. Maybe cellulosic production is ok--especially in polycultural and perennial systems. Corn-ethanol is counter productive. The nation may get swept up in it right now, but infrastructure designed for turning corn into ethanol will become obsolete in the near future.

Ethanol has been shown to be ineffective, as well as driving up the cost of food stuffs, such as corn, etc.

Ethanol is produced from corn or other crops that are needed as food. Increasing ethanol production will lead to higher food prices, maybe ever food shortages hurting everone and doing nothing to reduce atmospheric temperatures.

The first really good suggestion I've seen. It had better be cost effective.

Ethanol is NOT cost effective. Just those greedy corn conglomerates - who made our nation obese on corn syrup - wanting to screw us at the pump too.

This is not a good idea.

I do not support ethanol production - see also comments in ES-2. Ethanol and biofuels should be pursued, but only be as a product of waste, rather than a product of new inputs.

Only if Ethanol can be produced at a lower cost in energy that petroleum

Only if, overall as a whole, this truly helps to mitigate problems, rather than creating new ones.

it is always wise to fund RESEARCH, but never legislate our personal choices.

Ethanol requires astronomical amounts of energy to produce, when energy input for the commodity crop, processing, transportation, etc. is considered. We have an appalling abundance of corn and similar commodities in this nation already! I do NOT support supporting the corporate ag. giants who stand to be the principle beneficiaries of increased production.

Cellulosic ethanol, not starch based. See comments above related to utilization of food products for biodiesel. same applies to ethanol.

Forest residues and other waste should be used to produce electricity with the CO2 sequestered.

This will be a minor source, due to potential negative impacts.

Add to nit that nearly 30 years of incentives have not produce one gallon of production in Montana. Ethanol is not a cost effective fuel!! Renewable resource efforts should not attempt to direct materials (e.g. wood products) away from value-added manufacturing to energy production without an equivalent increase in raw material availability.

tricky area...must look holistically at all impacts, both fiscal and environmental on this source for energy. the trade-offs can be extremely harmful and detrimental!!!

See above comment on Biofuels, especially those like corn and other food crops or other crops that require pesticides and chemical fertilizers.

So far of what I've read, I'm not sure this can be done in a cost or energy effective way to make it worth doing...no vote until I know more.

It is not clear that production of ethanol is actually beneficial.

ethanol - at least with current technologies - does not merit support

This technology is already available.

I believe that when all is said and done, without conservation standard improvements, ethanol investment is a farce. As above, only support it when combined with conservation incentives.

Ethanol looks increasing like a problem for the environment and an expensive way to get alternative energy. Have you read the most recent reports??

ethanol is already costing more to produce and causing a greater environmental impact than if we hadn't been promoting it

Would prefer higher % of cellulosic.

Worse for the environment than reg gas. Again, no more ag welfare.

I think ethanol production will soon be determined to be non-green. Let's work on biodiesel, instead.

Ethanol from grain is a net energy loser in spite of what proponents say. The physics are just not there. Ethanol from cellulose might be OK it (or when) it is finally developed on a practical basis.

No mandated targets. Incentive only.

Yes to wood fiber and forest waste and grass based ethanol, NO to corn and other low carbon saving ethanol projects

Forest residues might be worth considering, but if we account for transportation costs, it might consume more energy than produced. Possibly consider producing ethanol from forest fuels removed from urban-forest interface to reduce fire danger. Agricultural land should be used to produce food, not energy. See also comment regarding previous question. Better strategy would be to reduce driving.

Let's guarantee that this ethanol production meets a low-carbon fuel standard and that waste cellulose and starch are targeted first for production. There's no reason we should be sending millions of dollars to Saudi Arabia, Houston, Alberta and Venezuela when we could be keeping those dollars at home.

First we must establish a policy against future sod-busting of native grasslands and prairie

Let them make their own decisions

AS LONG AS WE ARE NOT USING CORN FOR ETHANOL, I SUPPORT ITS DEVELOPMENT!!!!!!!

Ethanol from corn is not effective! Requires tons of fertilizer, tons of water-doesn't make sense. Using forest residues is also not convincing... What about algae?

The emphasis in 2015 and 2020 str too high on starch based ethanol and too low for cellulosic ethanol. A more aggressive approach to the cellulosic biorefinery effort is needed. The starch based method doesn't save much GHG or energy by comparison to the cellulosic.

Ethanol production is not the way to go. Better to reduce driving.

Ethanol is a loser...wake up guuys and stop the waste.

Ethanol is not worth the energy needed to produce it.

Belongs in the private sector. Mandates are artificial and not cost effective.

I support cellulosic ethanol only. No corn or other such crops.

With the prices rapidly increasing, conserving natural resources is a matter the free market can handle without government mandates.

Ethanol is the most impractical fuel of all. Less power, less miles per gallon, higher total cost, and contributes to more GHG problems than fossil fuels. Bio-diesel, for seasonal use is much better for all.

Should emphasize/require that ethanol production be local, small-scale, and doesn't threaten other agricultural needs.

ethanol is not a wise use of our natural resources

Food to Fuel is absolute insanity. The poor are hit hardest by the increased food costs this is already causing across the nation.

encourage cellulosic research, the only sustainable ethanol

too disruptive to the market price for food, why not nuc plants for power or hydro

I HATE ETHANOL, send it back to MN!

yes, bio mass

it the starch based from corn? i don't believe that is the way to go. i am very interested in this, could you give me a direction of were to find this practice happening?

Does the technology exist? Is it cost effective? Is it energy efficient? Love the idea of using forest slash and municipal waste to produce energy.

There is so much wrong with this, I don't even know where to begin.

Corn-based ethanol should NOT be produced under any circumstances - it's a waste of food and energy. Cellulosic ethanol is OK if economically viable.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. I doubt whether any Montana farmers had any input in this section.

Everyone knows how to make ethanol, the problem in Montana is cost, feedstock, no market for product or by-products. We have had incentives for years and still cannot secure financing for a plant because it is not financially viable.

<http://www.righttalk.com/asx/ggws.asx>

If Ethanol is such a great product why after using in many states around our nation is it still necessary for its production cost to be subsidized by the government. What government agency subsidizes "snicker" candy bar production, or "beer" products. None because they are in demand. No So with Ethanol.

In 1997, the General Accounting Office concluded, "ethanol's potential for substituting for petroleum is so small that it is unlikely to significantly affect overall energy security."

Meeting the lifetime fuel requirements of just one year's worth of U.S. population growth with straight ethanol (assuming each baby lived 70 years), would cost 52,000 tons of insecticides, 735,000 tons of herbicides, 93 million tons of fertilizer, and the loss of 2 inches of soil from the 12.3 billion acres on which the corn was grown.¹⁶ The U.S. only has 2.263 billion acres of land and soil depletion is already a critical issue. Soil is being lost from corn plantations about 12 times faster than it is being rebuilt.

Need research on cost effective

You better have the US Forest Service at the table with a guaranteed sustained supply or this will not fly. State and private cannot sustain or carry the feds much longer. Ask the enviro's what they will let you do.

Plant FOOD, not FUEL.

Must be able to show that system-wide CO₂ production from ethanol is significantly less than from existing gasoline.

Ethanol... another boondoggle.

Reduce red tape and taxes and you stimulate business ventures.

unintended consequences to other sectors from this program - I favor biodiesel with plants adapted to low moisture conditions, as opposed to corn production for fuel. (water dependent, fertilizers, etc.)

These incentives have been in place for 20 years and never used. Lets move on to something that will actually happen

Climate Change Advisory Committee Ethanol Recommendations.

Grain Conversion factors

*USDA Office of Energy Report Titled: The Economics of Producing Energy Crops

Wheat 2.7 gal/bu.

Corn 2.7 gal/bu.

Barley 2.0 gal/bu.

Montana Crop Production Levels 2005

*Montana Agricultural Statistics 2006

Wheat 5.235 million acres harvested

Barley 700,000 acres harvested

Corn 17,000 acres harvested for grain

Average Yields 2005

*Montana Agricultural Statistics 2006

Wheat 36.8 bu/acre

Barley 56 bu/acre

Corn 148 bu/acre

Amount of acres required to produce ethanol at the levels recommended by the CCAC

2010 50 million gallons/year of starch based ethanol

Wheat 503,220 acres

Barley 446,428 acres

Corn 125,125 acres

2015 110 million gallons/year of starch based ethanol

Wheat 1,107,085 acres

Barley 982,142 acres

Corn 275,275 acres

2020 250 million gallons/year of starch based ethanol

Wheat 2,516,103 acres

Barley 2,232,142 acres

DO NOT encourage any starch-based ethanol production in Montana. Encourage only cellulosic development IF it can be done sustainably using true wastes and without expanding cropland.

These incentives have been in place for 20 years and never used. Lets move on to something that will actually happen

We should not trade-off food production in order to enable the the citizenries' excessive driving habits of non-commercial standard/flex-fuel vehicles.

this would be done by industry if the state would stop interfering with industry, and we stoped the eco freeks

As long as it is voluntary, with real incentives.

In general I'd support this, but the specific numerical targets are too restrictive, and lock us into current technology and knowledge.

Ethanol production is not as climate friendly as originally thought when the full picture is looked at. I think this effort is best accomplished by Market Demand. Let's educate people, then let the economics drive this technology as appropriate.

Starve the people and increase fuel costs. Typical government solution.

So far this is not proven to be cost effective.

Tax \$\$\$ goin' down the drain. Let market forces drive technology.

Only cellulosic ethanol is viable -- starch based fuels drive up food costs and increase tillage, leading to higher GHG emissions from newly tilled land. See recent news reports on this issue. MT is well-placed to produce cellulosic fuels from ag and forestry wastes.

This is a lousy gift to agribusiness and industry at our expense. it does not reduce greenhouse gasses overall, and just as important-- ethanol is NOT renewable unless it is organically grown.

No way - what a waste of energy!

Incentives are good, requirements are bad.

Then the cost of our foods increase.....go more with less consumption and greater efficiencies.

See comments to RC II-1 above. Also, ethanol out here does not seem to be attracting any interest, despite legislative initiatives in 2005.

I would like to see less starch based ethanol and more of an emphasis on cellulosic ethanol, which reduces GHG emissions by 90% compared to the 10-20% reduction from corn based ethanol. Furthermore, relying on corn based ethanol will inevitably rise food prices.

Econmics needs to drive this industry. Incentives may be required to get it started.

Tranfering potential food production land use to fuel production seems terribly short sighted. This is not a them vs. us problem. Realistic projections of world population suggest there will be several billion additional souls joining our crowd. Is it realistic that the US pattern of fuel overconsumption should continue into the future?

From what I have read ethanol and biodiesel are not all they are hyped up to be. Ethanol is very inefficient, it leads to increase in food and is very energy intensive to produce.

ethanol=increased CO2+decrease fuel efficiency+increase food prices

Logging operations are simultaneously capital- and energy-intensive endeavors. Montana currently spends money to encourage these operations, with results that include risk of lost CO2 sequestration. To the extent that Montana continues on this path, it reverses many of the gains it hopes to achieve.

raises costs and taxes

Use these for local distribution, not into the profit grid.

Care must be taken to see that higher grain prices don't adversely effect livestock production, especially for small farmers

Hope corn-based ethanol production can be minimized.

you need to research these fuels to make sure they are not ruining water availability for other purposes - human consumption and minimum flows in streams

Biodiesel is not clean burning. It is also dirty to produce (with coal power used in this process). Growing the corn for biodiesel is a problem in itself. Corn requires more water than is appropriate in the arid west, and requires petroleum-based fertilizers.

Ethanol is not the answer to our energy woes. It is destructive of the environment and disruptive of the food and feed economies.

Good. I bought a car that can use ethenol but haven't seen any.

At this point I see no benefits from ethanal production, only negatives.

Ethanol is as big a scam as Carbon fearmongering. It costs more real fuel to transport and make than you get back. If it wasn't subsidized this would show.

Takes too much energy to make then what it produces.

all R+D on converting current waste products into usable matter sounds good. -- Research and development focusing on biomass from ag and forest residues and municipal solid waste and production processes.

Ethanol production is a net energy loser.

Ethanol is NOT the answer.

Sounds like a poor use of our soils. Is it moral to feed our insatiable energy appetite with the soil that provides our food and serves as a potential carbon sink? Step with care on this issue. Corn for ethanol does not make sense and I can not support this. Cellulosic ethanol is much more interesting since it is "waste", though it should be used for composting. Cellulosic ethanol from forest harvest residues is only rational, in terms of transportation costs, if the material is from within a 50 mile radius. In addition, you are removing the most nutrient rich material from the forest. This should be returned to the ecosystem from which it grew. Ethanol production is only an interesting option here in MT if we are talking about stands of switchgrass. Even this is questionable.

Another program that has a larger carbon footprint than when it's not being used. It takes more energy to grow the necessary cellulosic products than saved by their use.

This is a negative in energy efficiency, and is just politics.

Corn-based ethanol is efficient and takes corn out of the food chain, increasing food costs

I do not support policies that promote converting natural pasture to biofuel production. Bio-fuel production on existing crop land is reasonable.

Cellulosic ethanol may be good, but Montana taxpayers need not support production that is not cost-effective.

I'm still on the fence about ethanol.

MGY? Cellulosic. We have plenty of biofuel type trees and need to harvest more for lots more cellulosic ethanol!

These efforts should only proceed if it is proven, in advance, that ethanol production and use truly is a net carbon reduction, including all factors (such as production of petrochemical fertilizers, tractor fuel, processing energy expenditure, etc.).

Ethanol may in some ways pollute less however to produce more starch and cellulosic ethanol, it may take more oil from petroleum to grow more crops. Thus not really reducing pollution levels as much as promised but rather just changing the flow of pollutants and adding to the destruction of other neighboring eco-systems. Also more chemical pollutants entering the gulf coast is already destroying marine life and reef life. Without healthy oceans all life is significantly threatened.

Needs to be sustainable on all levels to work, from production to processing to emissions.

Ethanol is not as efficient as other petroleum. Put resources toward Hydrogen a true long term solution.

So far, ethanol has been a mistake. If we can learn from the mistakes, yes.

Ethanol production has extensive waste water issues and energy consumption required for processing outweighs energy release as a fuel. Should fully understand implications and costs.

Ensure that such production and use do not further pollute the planet and increase global warming

Ethanol production is driving up the cost of food, corn prices are up, beef prices are up (they require corn for feed), Pork and Chicken prices are up the eat corn. Again this is not an answer just a expense I must pay.

There are significant challenges to increasing ethanol production that are not being considered. Cellulosic ethanol technology does not provide commercial quantities of product. Ethanol has serious issues with transportation and lacks infrastructure to develop this recommendation. MPA also opposes the low fuels standards this recommendation is linked to in recommendation TLU-6

Who will pay for this?

In overall production and use, ethanol and biodiesel are not significantly better than fossil fuels in terms of carbon emissions. We need to focus on alternative sources that are truly low carbon or carbon neutral.

Cellulosic is the only ethanol that makes sense

Here is an area we should all get behind - not so much for the CO2, but for energy independence. Please!! Ethanol is not an alternative. It takes gas to produce and get it to market. You might get some votes in the corn belt but this is ridiculous. Does anyone ever look at the other side of the issue anymore?

Yes ! ! ! !

stupidest thing ever. just because old bushy bushy doesn't shutup about this on the TV, has no relation to the fact that this is the worst BTU's with carbon input method for fuels.

Ethanol fuel causes more pollution than regular fuel, the EU has found this out and in 2007 the EU has started the process of stopping the use of ethanol in fuel. The State should stay away from this.

(as I previously commented) obviously if it requires more fuel than it produces, or is subsidized to redistribute costs, this won't be a viable program. I do think it's worth a try, and should be given a chance to get off the ground. Cellulosic seems more sustainable, long term, especially in no-till systems.

Ethanol is an environmental disaster.

Haven't you read about the downside of using ethanol???

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bulls**t legislation. Global warming is NOT a fact (cold records set last winter in the southern hemisphere) so it might be Northern hemisphere warming, but not global. Secondly, latest studies of the sun spots (that control global temperatures more than humans) indicate that within 20 years we will be back in a 'mini-ice age'. Not politically correct, but MUCH more accurate.

Hard for average Montanan to understand. When in doubt I vote nay

Finally we are getting closer to what is practical. Don't waste land and energy growing crops. There is more than enough in our overgrown forests.

Cellulosic ethanol is much more efficient to produce as more of the feedstock is used. Plus any biomass will do, rather than corn or soybeans.

More money down the government drain

No Biofuels. TOO WATER INTENSIVE.

we need to look at how we're changing natural resource supplies and ecosystem components.

Already, this has skewed the market. More corn crops are being grown and now there is economic analysis taking all factors into account and the use of ethonol becomes much less efficient and more costly.

Food should not be made into fuel. Ethanol requires a lot of energy to produce, and has little if any net benefit.

We have to do it

Ethanol/corn based energy is in the long run, not an efficient source of energy and has negative economic effects which counteract it's original purpose. Attention should be given more to other bio energy resources.

yes and not corn

Cellulose yes. Corn no.

Be sure biodiesel product does not cost more energy to produce than it provides.

Not convinced ethanol is worth the investment. seems like a greenwashing by large corporations-- report isn't clear that ethanol production is from low-energy processes, rather than high-energy corn process. If that can work, using biomass, how is it different from biodiesel? (Need to read the report carefully, don't I?)

NO NO NO again. This is false technology! See above comments.

Why is the cellulosic production in 2015 half of the starch based production of 2010-or, the 2020 cellulosic is equal to the 2010 starch based production-c'mon!! Starch and cellulosic-no comparison between the 2-good God-give it up!!

This stuff gives me a headache!! there must be a better solution.

See easywatercar.com and research what happened to Aquagyn - the water-powered fast car modification that was bought by GMC and shuffled under the rug. Ethanol is no water. Technology exists to power our existing cars on water. It is just being squashed by big business. Please research and implement this important modification to cars.

do not use food plants.

Ethanol use more energy to produce than you get as an end product. Don't go down this energy path. It does not help climate change.

Recently General Motors acquired a share of Coskata, an Illinois company which claims to have developed a process which makes ethanol from almost any renewable source including garbage, tires, and plant waste. According to Argonne National Lab, Coskata's process produces 7.7 units of energy for every unit of energy input. It uses less than one gallon of water to produce one gallon of ethanol. The company claims to be able to produce this for less than 1\$ per gallon. I think we need to be cautious about promoting starch based ethanol. In light of developments like the aforementioned and questions about net energy gain and the effects on our food supply, most of the emphasis of this recommendation should be placed on cellulosic ethanol.

I hate seeing tree slash and crop residue burned in the open. Such a waste. I hope using the waste for fuel can be made cost-effective.

Ethanol creates other environmental problems and is not the solution we all had hoped it to be. I am concerned that there will be an increased degradation of streams/wells, etc., due to increased fertilizers, pesticides, etc., necessary to support the additional crops put into production.

I've heard the cost is far too high to make it work, and that producing food is and will be relatively much more important. Ethanol in gas reduces the mpg an engine gets. Why go this route at all, when surely there are others that will really get the job done?

Don't tell people what to plant. Unless you're an agronomist, you don't know what you're talking about. The market & the agronomic conditions should determine what is planted & hence what can be produced.

Does starch-based mean corn? cellulose ethanol is good; doubtful about the efficiency of corn-based ethanol. I don't believe that starch ethanol is a proven alternative, I would like to see more development of cellulosic ethanol.

taxpayer funded research and development. Do you think New Yorkers want to foot the bill?

Increasing ethanol production makes no sense using today's technology. More funding should be considered for education to improve technology.

See above. Make sure the carbon inputs are not significant

Same question as above. What are going to eat? No corn - no meat!

Let Marketplace dictate the production and consumption of ethanol.

May help clean up real estate. Again who would bare the cost?

no corn or crop ethanol unless it is from refuse

I would be more supportive if this had a greater focus on cellulosic ethanol

Only where ethanol production truly results in a net savings of energy.

Ethanol should only be used in small percentages to offset the poor fuel additives of the past. There is probably not enough farmland to provide E-85 or higher ethanol to all cars.

Increase level significantly, by the time frames shown.

There are significant challenges to increasing ethanol production that are not being considered. Cellulosic ethanol technology does not provide commercial quantities of product. Ethanol has serious issues with transportation and lacks infrastructure to develop this recommendation. MPA also opposes the low fuels standards this recommendation is linked to in recommendation TLU-6

Just don't obstruct the permitting processes or have biomass forestry screwed over by Greens.

Forest residues is only product alternative but since there is 85% of Forest land under federal ownership this will be difficult to have a successful Forest residual program.

Agriculture residue production is preferred over forestry residue.

Stay out of the private sector. Fire all personnel involved with this stupidity.

I do not believe that Ethanol is a viable replacement for petroleum in quantity. As we are currently seeing our tax dollars are being used to subsidise ethanol, as we are seeing a rapid inflation in food costs because of the competition for the ag. products.

Promotion of the use of waste products can prove to be beneficial

I do not believe that this is the job of government other than to encourage ethanol.

Not sure how this would work in conjunction with the idea of increasing lands used for organic farming.

Arbitrary goals are wacky. There is way more potential for cellulosic ethanol from millions of acres of overgrown forests that need fuel reduction. Cellulosic ethanol is way more efficient to produce than starch based and would not raise our food prices.

There should not be an incentive to sodbust/plow native prairie.

See above; Let the market direct research and development

Yes--R & D in all of these fields are well worth investigating. Again, the net gains need to be carefully considered.

corn does not have to be used

This form of energy production comes at a price = less organic matter returned to the soil = reduced soil productivity.

Should be reverse in terms of gallons per year between starch and cellulosic. Starch/food based ethanol production should be phased out and intense focus on cellulosic ethanol from forest biomass (thinning, understory removal, removal of dead trees)

forced use of ethanol creates lots of other problems - doesn't seem worth it.

Again, ALLOW MORE FREELY FOR DRILLING WITHIN OUR OWN COUNTRY. (See above.)

A careful study of the energy needed to produce ethanol as well as the scale of ethanol plants needs to be done before going blindly into large-scale production. What unintended consequences of large-scale ethanol production might there be?

Ethanol is another poor bandaid.

forest residues should be the focus

This is the best scenerio for ethenol production but it must be viewed as near as possible to a closed loop whereby the waste material is returned to the fields as fertilizer and erosion control.

this must be carefully monitored to make sure that the cost of human food and food for animals is not increased due to changes in crops.

LETS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT MORE AND MORE DE-FACTO WILDERNESS DESIGNATION AND WE WON'T HAVE AS MUCH BIOMASS RESIDUES FROM OUR FORESTS---ALSO CUT DOWN ON OFF ROAD VEHICLE EMISSIONS!!!

Again, we must be careful not to destroy or injure other values of forestry and agriculture.

How efficient is ethanol without the new cellulosic tehcnologies?

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.

Need to recognize serious flaws in ethanol production and use It is not carbon efficient

I have heard ethanol is not the answer, though I haven't researched it yet--so I will be more conservative on this one for now.

possible, but not probable.

Tentative support. I'm concerned about the impacts off over-harvesting to forest health, maturity and diversity. Need a commitment to restoration that is ecologically sound. Not just re-stocking.

This area is already federally subsidized and is not taking off - how much more can be gained here?

research and development is important. What is being done in other states and at the federal level - and within industry - that we can learn from without having to reinvent the research.

I do not support the use of feed grains for ethanol production; the efficiencies are far too low, and the effects on the world food supply are too severe. When cellulosic production becomes feasible, I will support that measure.

I think ethanol production has been tried and failed as a viable technology. Extension native rangelands were plowed up and later abandoned to speculative and marginal projects. Subsidizing, by incentives or otherwise, a new wave of experimentation is poor policy. The types of approaches mentioned also 'externalize' the costs of the production.

sound inefficient?!

No food crop based ethanol

no starch based ethanol. Also, "agricultural residues" are not a byproduct of crop production but a natural part of the process, the cycle. Removal of "agricultural residues" breaks the cycle thus reducing organic matter-humus and soil carbon essential to healthy crop production

there is climate change. But mans impact is limited. Maybe as little as less than 3-5% need cost benefit analysis

Hey take a look at what the corn ethanol is doing to the environment.

Starch based ethanol is insane, provide R&D dollars for cellulosic alcohol production. Diverting productive land to fuel use is insane

I like the idea of use of municipal solid waste. I do not want to see agricultural land being turned into energy production instead of food. Agricultural residue seems best left on farm to complete fertilization cycle.

I don't like the reports concerning CO2 production related to clearing of land for ethanol production. Would we produce more CO2 in this process?

Localized approaches work best; as long as the incentives don't prescribe particular feedstocks too exactly, they can be useful.

No corn ethanol

Research and development focusing on biomass from ag and forest residues and municipal solid waste and production processes - Important

Encouraging crop-based ethanol will increase CO2, as native grasslands will be tilled, causing an enormous release of stored carbon. It will also stress rivers, due to the high water requirements for production.

The benefit of ethanol is now in question.

Would depend a lot on what is used as source of cellulose. I do not favor corn based ethanol. worthy of research but let it develop at its own pace without throwing too much money at it.

Re-use of waste materials sounds good to me. Consider the effects on soil of removing all cellulosic waste materials (like straw, wood chips). Look at this from a wide angle to see the pluses and minuses.

As long as the fuels do not result in a net increase in CO₂ emissions. For example, if biomass is imported from other countries (carbon footprint) and is shipped in trucks from the port (carbon footprint) I would have concerns.

Only if private funds are used, no tax payer dollars.

In the near-term, Investment in increased ethanol production will require incentives.

Let's use the most sustainable feedstock for ethanol.

Cellulosic ethanol production has not yet shown to be scaled up to be economical.