

CC-2 Comments
Recommendation 51
State GHG reporting

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

Sounds like another government bureaucracy funded at tax payer expense.

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

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.

Who would have to report?

to expensive and potentially punitive as all sources might not be identified appropriately if the process is hurried.

and then use the information to educate the public, decision makers, and investors (all of us - tax-payers, corporations, equity financiers, etc.).

This should be the highest priority.

Why?

Seems as if they already should be reporting these gases, based on constitutional requirement of healthy environment.

The science is not in.

Another waste of time & money.

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

I think we should coordinate with national efforts.

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's contributing to "global warming" is a disputed theory.

Are we going to regulate breathing?

This will be another huge cost. Only regulators and environmentalists are in favor of this.

This is not clear - who is reporting to whom.

what if there is no GHG? then this is a colossal waste of money.

It will probably take a few years to implement this because of all the regulations that will be involved. You have virtually no rules in effect now--BUT GET STARTED NOW!

What is the purpose and cost and who pays?

The state does not need more onerous recordkeeping and reporting requirements for the sole sake of collecting data.

Maybe incentive if could separate areas or cities; most improved award or other incentive, even if just a plaque, might instill a sense of green pride.

asap, like you said!

more bureaucracy costs more...not sure about this one

should have being in 2007

Critical.

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.

We do not need any new reporting programs. How many new FTEs will be required and how much will that cost?

It will happened on its own once the effect of past carbon consumption takes full effect; much like traffic reporting.

Garbage

WE DO NOT HAVE THE MONEY

No increase in spending.

At what cost? What is the benefit?

Again, promotion of bad science.

This is a key component for all other legislation.

More useless cost to business, it's getting so that the reporting is 30 percent of any business overhead we are going to put small business out of business

First step for "big brother"

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

Should not be a burden on industry,

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

The sky is not falling!

Who will fill out this unneeded form--The taxpayer I am sure?

To who will the report be submitted? For what purpose?

At what Cost.

It has take me over 3 hr to get to this point, but I felt this was an important survey.

Again, you are basing GHG on flawed reporting, on theory, and that is absolutely wrong.

How much and who will do it?

As long as not cost prohibitive

To determine what?

no such thing

I think this will increase the knowledge of everyone with regard to GHG's and that would be a good thing. Probably get a lot of belly-aching, but the more the people understand, the better chance we have of something worthwhile happening.

Move too fast & you'll get garbage for data. Think this out first. Implement in 2010.

Only if the State bears the FULL COST of such reporting and provides an LINE ITEM funding for such reporting AND provides and ANNUAL REPORT to every taxpayer on the COST of such a report

Wonderful way to track how we're doing.

Waste of time and money.

If this is rushed, as is indicated in CC-2, mistakes will be made. Take the time to do it right!!!

raise taxes for more reporting programs

Junk science. No.

Of course. Use the results to improve the effectiveness of the goals outlined in this survey.

A complete waste of taxpayer money.

Non-problem doesn't need taxpayer money wasted on it.

Make it good, accurate, and reliable.

Don't impose reporting on MT business.

And make it available to everyone.

YES!

Bureaucracy to report to?

Who needs another report, lets get to work and do it!!

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.

HOW WILL YOU MEASURE THIS? CO2 makes up 0.03% of the atmosphere, do we have the technology to measure a 0.001 or 0.002% increase in this gas?

Montana should first study the current major greenhouse gas emissions and emission reductions protocols now in use and implement the best one. This will increase the probability that Montana's data will be consistent with expected federal GHG regulations

Forget it. Too costly.

Reporting is the same as spying. We would have a State full of 'free' people who are controlled by government.

More union state bureaucratic jobs, yeah!

Just what good is this?

Who will be enforcing this and ensuring accurate reporting?

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.

ABSOLUTELY NOT !!!

GHG. Perfect. Report to an acronym. Where do you get these ideas? Karl Marx?

WHO IS GOING TO PAY FOR THIS

Would the reports be useful for comparative study on a national level?

education and volunteerism needs to be incorporated. seems that 2008 is rather unreasonable.

Feedback systems are worth gold.

This should be standard.

Include it with weather report on the evening news.

Spend your time trying to figure out how to curb the 85% of all green house gases that come from the ocean instead.

What is GHG?

really, you think the polluters don't know?

Hire more people to do more paper work. When the report comes out, then what?

To eliminate duplication should be implemented when federal requirements are adopted.

Definitely in 2008.

Montana should first study the current major greenhouse gas emissions and emission reductions protocols now in use and implement the best one. This will increase the probability that Montana's data will be consistent with expected federal GHG regulations

Well, why don't we wait a bit to see what Mean Old Mister Sun has in mind for us?

Waste of \$\$...sounds like a make work program.

Additional fodder for lawsuits.

Unnecessary and costly bureaucracy.

This is a waste of Government and Private Resources! We have more significant issues to deal with. Let's not waste it.

Report to whom? And what about: quantity? source? ??

THE SOONER THE BETTER!

SOONER THE BETTER

just as soon as China gives us a report

YUP, MORE BUREAUCRACY---

But let's see action, not just reports.

should be national

Okay, but let's be reasonable in implementation. CA is not the model for everything.

information and data collection is important to see if any of these other steps you propose actually makes a difference

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

Negative, until taxpayer is fully informed on costs and government accountability standards.

Holcim supports the development of a GHG reporting system that is based on established methodologies and without overburdensome reporting requirements. However, any reporting requirements should be compatible with anticipated federal requirements.

The immense complexity of acquiring and keeping the data has been greatly downplayed and should be examined more closely. A partial database of just one group or sector will have no value unless the entire database is available.

??

