

CC-6 Comments
Recommendation 54
Options for state GHG goals or targets

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

Until there is a cost-benefit analysis done on some of this, it should absolutely not be put into statute. We need money for education, for health care, for prisons, etc. Reducing GHG in Montana at an unknown or exorbitant cost to Montana citizens would be an irresponsible act. The committee that put together this "Plan" was stacked with environmental nazis who have ulterior motives. There were only three people on the committee who had any understanding of industry issues. Consumers and low-income people were not represented at all. Rank and file Montana voters are not yet willing to accept the cost of implementing the Climate Change Action Plan in toto.

Not yet

Standards of living will have to decrease. Costs will be passed on to consumers.

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.

Oregon Institute of Science . You are not using sound science.

If global warming continues to accelerate, we may well have to speed up this transition dramatically.

What does set in statute mean? How would they be implemented?

the 80% reduction by 2050 doesn't work very well with the puny 5% reduction by 2025 - at that rate, it will be hard to get to 80% within 25 years.

Only can achieve this if new nuclear or hydro-electric power plants are constructed.

NO-NO-NO-NO

Need to accelerate 80% to an earlier date

Excellent - set the standards and goals high as a first step.

Why?

Lets just kill the economy, all buy horses and move back to the farm. Oh Wait! The rural communities have been de-funded.

Remove the subsidies, and goals won't have to be in statute.

This is quite ambitious!

Get real! Should we all just abandoned the use of combustion engines?

Why not sooner?

However, I do not support large-scale industrial-style corporate wind farms and their accompanying transmission lines! Small distributed alternative energy systems, especially rooftop solar, have less impact on landscapes and provide plenty of jobs!

Can't be achieved - prepare for the potential effects.

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

What are the detailed economic consequences of this recommendation. I don't accept the "30,000foot" level described by Director Oppen. This could have huge economic consequences.

Need sound scientific studies, not just the liberal views that humans are killing the earth. Many scientists don't agree with the Al Gore scenario.

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.

Human caused global warming is a hoax. The last ten years have cooled! The farce is starting to evaporate at this point. Let it die an undignified death. We do not need to tie economy hurting legislation to yet another extreme weather change "the sky is falling" hype.

Again, government fiat. Soviet Five Year Plans failed, this absurdity will fail also. Rather focus on real science-based measures such as upgrading physical plant, conservation, proven alternative energy technologies, etc. Our national and state economy MUST be destroyed to meet these goals. If Progressives want to do this to Montana, I suggest they move to California or Massachusetts with the rest of their ilk.

Be more aggressive.

Please use common sense in the area of climate change. Climate change has always been taking place and always will. Reference dinosaurs and the last ice age. Once again react to facts not emotions.

I see no need to "reduce green house gas emissions to 1990 levels". We want to grow as a state and a nation, not fall back.

This will create a huge expense and have a negligible effect on global warming which is going to occur no matter what we do. See Avery and Singer on the web.

Gotta be way sooner than 2050.

Still going to take a huge education effort. Just look at the folks in Choteau who don't even believe in Global Warming, and are so paranoid about it, they don't allow a Nobel Peace Prize winner to talk to their kids about why the kids should consider becoming a scientist.

Government should not legislate anything. If the climate is changing, it might be due to earth moving, or sun moving. It might not be anything man is doing.

Now you are talking. But make sure any rules you make are enforceable

Not a realistic goal without an economic plan to drive the state's economy.

It needs to happen faster. We need to cut back more before then.

Absolutely not. There is a serious lack of science in this report and whole lot of scientifically unsupported policies and pure bogus speculation in these recommendations.

I don't believe this goal is achievable without significant impacts on Montana's economy.

NO, NO, NO. Not on Montanan's backs

Look into Germany's plan and how, despite disbelief in simply achieving goals, they surpassed them. Excellent incentives for solar, but increase in utilities helped pay for incentives, but nearly all Germans approved. Worth the looking into, I feel

Absolutely NOT.....

Accelerate these reductions.

sooner would be much better!!!

I do think legislation should reflect state interests not federal interests.

Assumin it is possible and realistic.

This could be a disaster for our economy.

Yes, yes.

Unrealistic unless you reduce the population.

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

Absolutely not. There is not enough information to adopt any of these goals. A thorough cost analysis of each item needs to be conducted. A few people on a committee, who were not representative of mainstream Montanans, adopted a cookie cutter plan put together by a group located in the East.

NEVER!!!! THIS IS EXACTLY THE WAY TO ENSURE THAT MONTANA NEVER GETS OUT OF THE ECONOMIC CELLAR THAT SIMILAR ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES HAVE PUT US IN.

80% below 1990 levels by 2050 is only a start...we'll need to go further than that.

Absolutely not

Setting goals is the first step to reaching them.

Why go only to 1990? Take it back further!

THERE IS NO NEED FOR THIS

What is this question for? If you do not support any item above, you can't possibly support this. This is a trick question for politicians.

Waste of time and money. See above.

YES, YES YES!!!

Politics is called the "art of possible". Lets mandate only what is possible not that which is only desireable.

Again, promotion of bad science.

when the SUN gets hot ,the earth gets hot,andthe same on the other side

An absolute must.

We must do this, to say to ourselves and to the rest of Montana that we are committed to doing our part.

just more government

Cart before the horse again.

Do your homework! So much of what is here makes no sense when viewed with actual science.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. Let technology develop. Montana's poor and middle class cannot pay any more for energy.

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

DON'T THINK THIS IS POSSIBLE WITH INCREASING POPULATION.

Less people would result in reduced GHG resulting in meeting the target. See comment on CC-2

What is so magical about 1990, Why don't we go back to 1974-1975 level when we were worried about global cooling and the next coming Ice age.

Not realistic

Yeah harness the next generation with this

We should go even farther than this to reduce CO2 emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2025. See the website globalwarmingsolution.org and read their plant Rosie Revisited

I resent government pushing these goals on us. I saw the list of those on the Climate Change Advisory Council and I don't think there was adequate representation for the small business person and the consumer. There has not been an adequate study of the costs associated with these proposals--what it will cost the consumer, the business person, and the government--which is the taxpayer. I do not believe the claim that any of these proposals will save money. Or, what little money is saved, it will take years to recover the cost, if that is even possible. Many of these proposals seem to take away my opportunities for choices and the mandates will only result in more government. Let the market respond. You don't see trucks idling for long in truck stops because the price of fuel is too high and they have to watch costs. Business are looking at ways on their own to cut energy use to try to keep the cost of doing business down. Energy companies are making energy audits available to homeowners to cut down on energy

Totally oppose because the numbers are suspect.

Not sure the target is doable within time frame, but DO support some goal and a way to measure success.

what if we can't make it? Shut the doors of all the businesses in Montana?

Recommended actions are ok but to put them in state statute would be ridiculous

Absolutely not. Nearly every recommendation has a regulation or standard in it. All of those come with a cost. Has anyone done an in depth study of the cost of all of this is. Those costs will be passed on to the consumer. Before anything is done the cost should be analyzed by an uninvolved third party. This is the most regressive plan we could have come up with. The wealthy can afford to purchase, build and retrofit. Those of us who can't will bear the cost of increased regulation. I can't leave this without saying that a blind survey is not a good way to develop public policy.

should be more aggressive.

no such thing

Never!

I like the idea of setting overall goals, but we need to fully understand the benefits that will result, because they will definitely change lifestyles and increase costs. The 1990 level by 2020 seems reasonable, I think it's too early to set a level for 2050. Let's take one step at a time and not get ahead of ourselves. We may set something we regret later when we understand climate change better.

Existing facilities should be grandfathered to new requirements. Regulate new proposed generators of GHG

The CCAP was a preconceived document brought into our state by a 'consultant' that had a predetermined outcome.

BS. The technology may not be available, isn't now. Plus the theory of "global warming" is just that, a theory. Anyone look at the sun lately? No sunspots = increased energy output. Look at the entire picture. Keep an open mind.

NO NO NO

80% by 2050 could very well be TOO LATE. This is the right start, but we need to push for more aggressive cuts. James Hansen has stated that we may be PAST the tipping point. Please, work as hard as you can, for the sake of future generations, to push for aggressive cuts. In the mean time, I applaud you for this work. It's a step in the right direction!

I think we need to be more aggressive.

Make that 80% by 2025.

Need to see what the federal approach is. Why should Montana put our businesses at an economic disadvantage?

heroically optimistic. Who pays?

The only way to reach the 2050 goal is to eliminate 80% of the population, and to completely stop all growth (which is something that the state has been pretty good at lately).

Reduction of emissions by 80% below 1990 levels is a good core to Montana's overall efforts.

con games there have been at least 3 ice ages and subsequent warmings that have occurred on this planet before man was even around, and now you think we are responsible for it now. obviously there is no intelligent life on this planet. once people thought the world was flat. also the magnetic poles of this planet have changed many times including complete reversals. this is recorded in the ejected lava from volcanos, as it hardens the atoms in the metal align themselves with the poles like a compass would, and this shows the poles have moved even between eruptions from the same volcano. you have no ability to change, or interrupt the evolution of this planet at all. get over your godly aspirations cause you are not God.

Junk science. No.

I would like to see even more ambitious targets, but I understand that this report was based on consensus and will respect that.

You need progressives in the Legislature who have the guts to implement this sort of thing.

We need to reduce the levels well below the 1990 level! Climate change was occurring before 1990!!!!

See CC-2. This entity should be used to increase reduction goals and achievements. Montana should be committed to being a leader in this field, not a resentful follower of national and global norms. Improving will boost the economy of farmers, ranchers, engineers, environmental analysts; it will be a boon.

A huge, costly mistake that will achieve no benefits to residents, but impose huge costs on residents. A misguided and unscientific policy.

Non-problem. Do not destroy the economy to appease a bunch of guilty ignorant rich people who leech off of it.

Enforce immigration laws and tax large families for stress on globe and infrastructure. \$1000 per child over two.

Where is the technology to do this??????

Don't put the cart before the horse.

Montana can not effect change but can hurt local business. We should be part of national program.

Not everyone in this state believes in the "Sky is Falling" mentality of the Climate Change activists. There is a great deal of information available that supports this climate cycle as normal and very minimally impacted by man's footprint.

(GHG? Oh! "green house gas" about time.) Is this possible?

Needs to be reduced to earlier levels than the 1990s. With compliance ordinances in place by 2010.

Montana MUST wait for the federal government to act. To do otherwise will do nothing to nationally or globally address climate change and will only cause "leakage" of carbon emissions as well as jobs to surrounding states. Montana's economy will thus suffer Enormously with no national or global improvement in carbon emissions. Also, federal action may create additional mandates and costs as well as provide critical federal energy research and development funding. This funding is key to determining the feasibility of any Montana GHG reduction mandate. Cooperatives are committed to and are already doing our part to reduce carbon and know from experience what will work; one of the MT co-ops' major power supplier is a national leader in carbon capture and sequestration research and development!

Mandates costing taxpayers. I am not against being responsible and doing what we can to take care of this old Earth but most of the proposals listed here are based on unproven technology and are going to be at pretty healthy expense as either a direct cost to the consumer or through taxes. I lose both ways.

Goals and targets are not reasonable.

NO! This would be a terrible idea!

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.

America can do better and Montana can do better than this and it will help our country and the world! We might even reclaim our leadership and relationships on this small planet.

Reduce emissions 100% by 2030

Don't pass laws on a flawed hypothesis. There is a great body of information that supports the conclusion that this is nothing more than a normal climate variation that has happened before and will happen again.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Why are you so worried about GHG? CO2 is such a small amount of our total atmosphere. Also, how do you propose to measure GHG? There is far more natural CO2 and GHG in the atmosphere.

Think of national policies that may be set - will Montana then have to amend theirs?

YES!!! We need statutory mandates. This is the single most important recommendation.

Do I have to remind you that a 'statute' is nothing more than a law which results in more control?

What makes man think that he can control the climate? Please do a little research on the other side of the issue instead of drinking this coolaid.

Green house gas and people cause global warming is a farce, the State has no business getting involved in it.

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.

This Action Plan appears to be thought up by a very biased group of individuals who want to cram their opinions down my throat. It also appears that they are not the smartest bunch of individuals in the state as these proposals are not well thought out. These proposals will result in actual higher costs to business and consumers, with only "hoped for" cost reductions. Montana is a low income state with already a high cost of living and this Action Plan will make things worse.

"Big picture" economics and feasibility of goals need to always be considered

What is to become of our national and state economy as we make these drastic cut backs to reduce green house gas emissions? These plans and projections are based on unproven green house gas models that have more to do with politics than they do with real science. Real science tells us that not only is the earth warming but so are other planets in our solar system. There is more science indicating that it is the sun that is heating up and in turn causing the climate to warm here on earth. We all might benefit much more by identifying ways to adjust ourselves to surviving in a warming earth climate rather than how to put the toothpaste back in the tube. If history is any harbinger for the future; this current warming period will be followed by a distinct cooling period that will be equally as potentially detrimental to life as we know it.

The climate will do what it wants to do as IT ALWAYS HAS.

Sure, lets reduce the GNP...that way we will have many more poor people.

Too little too late. Should be 80% by 2020.

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING IS BASED ON JUNK SCIENCE. PLEASE DO THE RESEARCH AND DON'T STEAL FROM THE PUBLIC THAT YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT!

time frame should be reduced to 2010 and 2030. we may not have that much time to be effective.

Too many unknown factors. Why use 1990 as a base line?80% is monumental change for a time we know nothing about.

- Montana Electric Cooperatives' Association believes Montana must wait for the federal government to act on climate change legislation. To do otherwise will do nothing to nationally or globally address climate change and will only cause "leakage" of carbon emissions as well as jobs to surrounding states. Montana's economy will thus suffer enormously with no national or global improvement in carbon emissions.
- Also, federal action may create additional mandates and costs as well as provide critical federal energy research and development funding. This funding is key to determining the feasibility of any Montana GHG reduction mandate.
- A general perception exists that carbon reduction can be done with minimal sacrifice such as transition to energy-efficient light bulbs. Few people realize the enormous economic consequences of ill conceived, poorly timed legislation.
- Co-ops are committed to and are already doing our part to reduce carbon and know from experience what will work; one of the Montana

If Montana produced NO greenhouse gas, it would have no impact globally. Look what's happening in China! Why should we saddle Montana citizens with the costs of all of these proposals for no benefit? If such measures were implemented nationally, the drag on the economy would be severe. Is this a benefit to anybody other than our economic competitors?

Work with other states and federal government to standardize goals.

By focusing on methane rather than carbon dioxide net emissions may readily, but temporarily, reduced to less than zero while the carbon dioxide problem is being dealt with. This is the only possible approach which can work.

First you need to prove that mankind is that powerful in climate change.

You'd better-I'll be gone-but-----

At the rate we've been going so far, as a nation, with the powers that be in Congress, the White House, and in the oil companies being REactive, can't we do better than this in the future. If we get in gear (or better yet, in CVT, continuously variable transmission, can't we aim higher. Once people are educated, and are motivated to GET IT DONE?!

Find out what the effects truly are before trying to set goals & targets to, I assume, mitigate damage.

stupid worthless idea

this goal should be reached earlier than 2050

GHG is a big farce!

This is another example where CCA's plan does not provide adequate justification for adoption of these goals. There needs to be a detailed analysis of impact on employment, housing, cost of energy, etc.

If not sooner. 2050 may be too long to wait to get back to 1990 levels. We should be running a lot more green by then.

1990 levels by 2010

this should be done sooner and can be!

Cause of climate change is unknown, but it happened 1500 years ago, too. Funny, but I do not recall hearing about gas emissions in 400 AD

Establish reductions to 1990 sooner than 2020, try 2012.

This is way, way too late, 2050 is 40 years from now...do you really think we have 40 years to do this? I doubt it very much, and I am not likely to still be on planet earth in 40 years...please think of the children..

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

No, so far most of this looks like a total waste of time.

By 2050, it probably won't matter. Read "The Long Emergency" by James Howard Kunstler

There is nothing you, the state, the country, I, can do about climate change. The climate has been changing for eons and will continue to do so with or without the stupid proposals in this survey. Did I mention, HOAX??

Needs to occur sooner!

Let sounder minds prevail. Give it ten years before taking any action, and we'll find that the chaff will be separated from the wheat.

I don't agree that global warming is essentially man-caused. I believe in common sense conservation, weatherization, and alternative sources of power, but not without keeping fossil fuel development at the forefront.

This would end Montana's economy and what quality of life we have left.

Is this doable? 2050 seems a long ways in the future, but time flies. There might be major volcanoes or other natural events that could affect society's ability to hit this hard number exactly in 2050.

I agree with the directive. However, I think we need to respond sooner than 2020. If we don't respond faster, we may not be able to combat global warming. Once that bell has been rung, it'll be too late to respond.

The planet needs all the help it can get.

does this mean we are going to tell the feds where to put their "let it burn policy"? There

Goals will need to be even more aggressive.

What happens if this is unattainable? Growth in Montana may make it unfeasible.

As ammended, as I have stated above. Mankind, alone, is not "responsible" for climate change. Numerous notable scientists are calling this "global warming" scare a farce. Again, we need to be responsible stewards. But we need to realize all that is really going on in our world. Numerous studies are showing the NEGATIVE GHG impace of the bio-fuels. Bovine flatulence contributes more to negative GHG emissions than our fossil fuels do. Numerous studies are pointing conclusively once again to a global cooling. To provide "incentives" for bio-fuel-run transportation is ignoring the fact that it will be an incredible dollar amount to replace every vehicle in this country with these. By and large, we are a country running on fossil fuels-- which have not been conclusively shown to not be renewable. Our dependancy on foreign oil needs to be replaced by dependancy upon our own, and this will happen when we once again allow free, responsible drilling on the lands of our own country.

Reduce more, sooner.

Let's have even higher goals -- let's get our greenhouse gas emissions to 1970 levels. Come on, people! Aim high -- it's do-able if everyone gets on board and if it is painful enough NOT to do it.

SOUND GREAT, BUT IMPOSSIBLE DO TO POPULATION GROWTH---

GNP expects that federal legislation to regulate GHG emissions will be passed in the near future and we are developing our business plans accordingly. In the meantime, we believe it would be ill-advised for Montana to adopt GHG emissions regulations in advance of federal legislation. Any regional or Montana-specific regulations would have an infinitesimal impact on global climate change. "Early adoption" of regulations would impose significant costs on Montana businesses and consumers and would send an anti-business message to energy developers driving new projects and related investment to neighboring energy-producing states such as Wyoming and North Dakota.

Higher percentage. See "Rosey Revisited" at globalwarmingsolutions.org: 80% below 1990 levels by 2025. So why aren't we doing that?

we don't need any more statutes

Yes!

Goals are OK but we do NOT need to put these into a statute.

It is unwise to mandate these things when don't have plan to do so.

yes.

Faster implementation 2015 at least. Our problems will not grow in a straight line , but rather, exponentially.

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

80% below 1990 by 2020. We don't have time.

Let's do that. Now.

A "goal" does not belong in statute.

We can't wait that long!!!!

No No No. No statutes. goals are fine but we must have electricity don't lock us up with no escape until technology catches up!!!!

how can we set a goal, without a standard to compare it to

a costly program to be carried on the backs of the poor.

No qualified data exist for 1990 GHG emission levels for ALL sectors so how can there be goals based on reduction relative to 1990 levels?

OR SOONER

An efficiency portfolio mandate is unnecessary for not-for-profit, consumer-owned electric cooperatives. Co-ops have for years been strong promoters of energy efficiency measures by customers as well as providing financial incentives for conservation.*Those members who have listened to their cooperatives promotion of energy efficiency have acquired a high level of energy efficiency.