

CC-1 Comments
Recommendation 50
GHG inventories and forecasts

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

who pays for the forest fire emissions? How do you predict them?

Is this a state project? Since it is perceived as a world wide issue, why is Montana doing the inventory and forecast?

What will this cost and who is going to pay for this?

Yellowstone National Park is the biggest pollution source in MT. Regulate the water and air coming out of the Park.

The state could build on the existing inventory.

Excellent!

???

Spend the money on infrastructure and training workers to transition to renewable energy and to becoming efficient in building and ways to be self-sufficient/efficient in energy

Educate all the people all of the time.

Why?

Don't forget to include all (city, state, federal) government GHG producing entities in you data compilation.

Seems this already is available.

Does this include total GHG? including those from all sources?

WE need a place to start, we also need to know what the impacts are on Montana and what we will contribute.

Stongly favor!!!

waste if resources.

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

New DEQ program? Funding? fees, assessments, general fund?

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

GHG science is inconclusive at best. in fact, the more likely event is global cooling see:
<http://ibdeditorial.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=287279412587175>

Limit this "monitoring" to one or two state employees, working on a part time basis. It would be fiscal disaster to waste much money tracking a chimera. Better to have the "department" produce one nice report a year so that the deluded "co2-phobics" can be mollified.

This is the best idea you're purposing. Get the list of sources and start at the top and work down

\$\$\$\$\$ for naught. See Avery and Singer on the web.

Better to follow national international trends rather than fund separate accounting -- GHG emission sources and sinks are widely known at this point. Stop wasting money "independently" studying these problems and start funding meaningful, local changes to mitigate them.

sounds like gargantuan task and a lot of money.

This is great!

knowledge is key

yes, we must measure progress starting ASAP

asap, like you said!

Realistic scientific and cost-benefit analysis should be mandatory in any program adopted.
we need to know the real numbers

We know much of what we need to support the need for change. Some might be okay to emphasize the point, but better education of what we know would go a lot farther for the buck.

CRITICAL! Some of this being done now, I believe.

Good as long as cost is reasonable.

more govt waste

And how is this going to help?

Studies show that there is zero climate benefit to investing in GHG reduction infrastructure and monitoring. Clearly there is no consensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

How many new FTEs will this proposal require and what is the cost?

Should utilize federal assistance.

How can we manage it if we don't know when, where, and how much there is?

The national weather service should be and probably already is pursuing this type of reporting.

Garbage

Keep track of GHG. This allows for accurate assessments and understand areas in need of improvement.

If you want to reduce green house gases in a meaningful way, I suggest federal legislation reducing the amount of water vapor the sun is allowed to evaporate from our rivers, lakes and oceans each day.

Is this affordable? And doable?

Again, promotion of bad science.

This is a key component for all other legislation.

again at what cost and for what reason? Some one need a meaningless job

over my head

Why? What does this accomplish and how will it be used?

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states.

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

vodo science

More Government lobbying for More Government

how do you know how bad the problem is if you have not already done this, this is the cart before the horse. i would have assume that before you made your recommendations in how to improve you would have look in depth at where we are first.

You do not know what you are doing. You are basing this on false science, on false representation of the matter.

How much and who??

You have a typo. 'as soon a possible' should be 'as soon as possible'

Dependable baseline data is critical to any effective monitoring and implementation of long term change.

This would have a significant cost to acheive what end?

Getting an inventory is good. Then, determining exactly what reductions in that inventory will do for climate change would even be better.

This is more of a tool for the carbon traders than a method to reduce CO2

Waste of time and money.

raise taxes for more studies

Tell the truth

No.

The University of Montana (Missoula Campus) has already begun this process. From personal experience it is a good idea, but requires nuanced thought and skillful implementation.

A complete waste of taxpayer money.

Non-problem doesn't need a study to falsely make it into one.

Seems like a wasted effort, should be world wide.

This would be burdensome and not cost effective. Wait for a Federal program.

THis sounds expensive and intrusive.

This is a ridiculous goal. Montana has a huge carbon sink in its forests. Any forecasts would no doubt be based on some computer simulation, most of which are greatly flawed, in spite of words to the contrary.

Good info=good management

Only if reporting is part of US program. Don't impose more regulation and reporting on Montana business.

Very good, let's start with Plum Creek here in Columbia Falls.

Do so immediatly.

Based on who's standards and forecasts?

Spend our tax dollars elsewhere.

Scientific theories on global warming do not warrant new taxes or legislation. Need additional analysis to understand impact on consumers and penalties on business development.

Only if this is done with reputable science and not political psuedo-science which emminates the daily journalism!

It will tell us where we are at and where we will be going.

Who will pay! These things cost money that could be better used for healthcare and educaion.

This recommendation requires a thorough assessment of the impacts on the economy and technological feasibility.

Too costly, too stupid.

We cannot know how much of a reduction we are obtaining without accurate inventories.

This is vital. Without an accurate inventory all projects and reductions are going to be shots in the dark. We need hard data on this and it needs to be available at all levels of state government and disseminated to the general public. GHG emissions are a per capita problem and if people have a sense of how much they personally produce coupled with clear choices on how they can reduce it to target levels it could be more effective than all the other measures implemented. Furthermore it should be common sense to have a complete inventory. If we have a destination in mind, reduced emissions levels, and we don't know where we are right now, how are we going to know when we've gotten there or how far we even have left to go. If you don't know where you are you don't know where you're going.

This would lead to nothing more than an existing record on every person in the State of Montana. Do as government dictates ... or else. No thank you.

More research money, yeah!

This is already being done.

seems like you've done a fairly thorough job already--there's more than enough to work with for now.

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.

not clear

Totally unnecessary accounting nonsense.

One more handout for college grads who don't want a real job.

Is this scientifically possible at this time?

We need guidelines to go by, and standards set.

This should be done by the University, not by the timber industry.

education and volunteerism needs to be incorporated.

Especially if cap & trade would begin to value natural CO2 sinks....we might get those prairies back?

This should be standard.

And pay attention to the forecasts and make sure your plan is effective in light of what is forecasted. YOU might have to step up your measures. Don't lock in your percentages in other categories so that you can't react to what you find.

Too technical -- don't understand it. WHO THE HECK WROTE THIS SURVEY? There are companies and writers who know how to take technical information and make it accessible to layman. You very obviously did not do this. I CONSIDER IT A SIGN OF DISRESPECT FOR THE PEOPLE YOU SUPPOSEDLY SERVE.

Read the Smithsonian's report ... How much effect are we really having?

bad unconstitutional warrantless search procedure.

MORE GOVERNMENT WASTE!

More cost!!!

If it can be done with existing staffing and funding at DEQ.

Too pricey

Establish time frames.

This recommendation requires a thorough assessment of the impacts on the economy and technological feasibility.

Knowledge never hurt. But don't spend too much gathering too much arcana.

GHG's may or may not be causing global warming. Global warming may or may not be occurring. It all depends on who you listen to and what you believe. Much more important than inventory and reporting of GHG's, is conservation of fossil fuels.

Waste of \$\$ with no obvious benefit.

Fair and even-handed implementation of this could be helpful, but if agenda driven, then becomes politics.

Sounds like food for further lawsuits to me.

Unnecessary and costly bureaucracy.

Montana should not follow the global warming hoax like a bunch of dumb lemmings.

Who in Montana believes that the governor will keep anything private? He dug into campaign records and violated the trust of people on what they thought was personal info by sending them out "give me i know how much you gave" letters

This must include ALL SOURCES of GHG emissions, including livestock.

YES Yes Yes. Here is where to begin!

THIS DATA SHOULD EXIST ALREADY, AT LEAST UNTIL WE START USING SOME OF THE NEW PROPOSED FUELS---

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

national

Need to know GHG emissions to know what to target for reductions.

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

Holcim supports the development of an inventory based on established methodologies. However, any inventory should be compatible with the anticipated federal efforts.

Don't know what this means

Do this honestly, without preconceived conclusions on what you will find.

??