

**CC-7.1 Comments**  
**Recommendation 56**  
**Establish a target for reducing the state's own GHG emissions**

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

the biggest component of GHG is water vapor. Is anyone going to suggest the removal of water from our environment?

At what cost to tax payers?

Not yet until we see the technology to implement at a reasonable cost.

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.

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

quite a disparity here with only a 5% reduction by 2020 compared to an 80% reduction by 2050. 5% doesn't seem to be high enough.

More aggressive

Lead by doing.

Green House Gases are not causing the present climate change. Please encourage responsible study and education of climate change issues.

Why? We've got nothing better to do with taxpayers money?

Do not abuse the tax payers money in such an irresponsible manner.

A target for state GHG is fine, if we're not subsidizing behavior that encourages GHG emissions.

Again, an ambitious target.

2018 is too late--get moving!

Preparing for the change will be more productive than keeping score.

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

Does it have to take 10 years, I don't think we have that kind of time.

What's the true cost?

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.

This target is far too low. Even 1990 levels are too high.

How about 10% or 20% by 2020?

Be more aggressive.

Sooner than that.

Even lower!! We're not that active industrially, etc! We ought to be a leader, by a significant margin, challenging the rest of the nation (at least) to an extremely high standard.

We can always dream, can't we???

Reduce GHG emissions sooner and more severely.

And 80% below 1990 by 2050.

Not unless you also reduce the population back to 1990 levels!

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.

This type of approach will result in added costs and a lower quality of life for Montanans.

Goal is too modest, though. The State can do better.

A good idea that will go nowhere in a state where most believe there is no problem.

Garbage

Again, why only 1990? take it back further!

I would increase the target to 10% by 2020. These target are very achievable. The higher education facilities could be converted to woody or ag biomass heating systems like UM Western and the U of Idaho and save substantial money and GHG emissions.

Support with no increase in spending. Perhaps the way to do this is return to 1990 FTE levels.

Is it practical and cost effective?

Lead by example

What will be the cost and what will be the source of funding, government cost too much now.

Do what you want as long as it doesn't increase my taxes! And GOOD LUCK!!!

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.asx>

This would be Good, I am all for eliminating government waste, an less talk would be a good place to start. One car, one truck at a time. but no additional expenditure of my tax dollars to carry out a plan that is based on a wrong assumption.

While we are at it let us reduce government to its 1990 levels and govenment spending also. That should dramatically reduce the waste going inot the environment.

The state can lead by example where practical

ramp up effort... to 1990 levels by 2015 and 20% below by 2020

should be more aggresive.

no such thing

I think the State should have the same level set for the people. If thats 1990 levels by 2020, than leave it the same. Let's do what really matters, not just for the sake of how it looks.

Too weak. We need 20% below 1990 levels by 2020.

I can't support this until I know how much this will increase my taxes.

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

fantasy land

MORE

Would there be a GHG problem all other states put out the same amount of GHG as Montana???? Why hamstring Montana for the GHG emissions of others?

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

What will the cost to the taxpayer be?

Why fix what isn't broken.

The government should lead by example, but not increase the cost of state government or increase taxes.

Only if cost-efficient.

If this is practical?

Again, these levels should consider each states history yet be decided at a federal level to hopefully ensure less biases.

Can't be done piece-meal.

Taxpayer monies based on what facts?

Very good idea! It's great to see Montana trying to be progressive and ahead of the game in areas that are unexpected!

How about 2012

Lead by example and not regulation.

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.

We should strive to do better than this! We will need to change the way we do business!

At what cost to the taxpayer? NO!

Efficiencies are good as long as they are cost effective. Mandated target levels are a concern as care must be taken to ensure the the costs involved are reasonable.

YES!!!

You should be able to do better than this.

just a waste of tax money

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.

Why the big difference from the production-based emission goal?

Targets are nice. Who pays for the bullets?

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

At what cost to the taxpayer?

Do more.

Too low.

Do better than 5% below 1990

The 2020 reduction should be a greater %.

The State needs to be a good example.

Yes, so important for our government, representatives, to set the example !!

Good start not enough.

Why? The evidence isn't clearly showing that we're making any difference.

sounds good, what is the cost?

Faster

appalling that our goal is 1990 levels

Do it sooner, and to a higher reduction by 2020.

reduce levels by a minimum of 10% below 1990 levels by 2020.

Efficiencies are good as long as they are cost effective. Mandated target levels are a concern as care must be taken to ensure the the costs involved are reasonable.

No.

Do sound thinking and make efficient and reasonable decisions. Everything at any cost is not intelligent.

Again, these goals are pretty wimpy. Good direction, but come on. The time is NOW

OR BETTER

All these things depend a lot on how much they would cost

Not aggressive enough

In 1990 MT had 800,000 people, 2000 just 902,200. in 2006 th est was 944,000 2% less growth than the US. We have 6 persons per square mile compared to 80 for the US. MT is less than 1% of the GHG emissions. Don't paint us into the corner. Common sense not emotional hype.

Again, I am for responsibility. But responsibility cannot happen when only one-sided information is presented to the public.

Use coal tax trust funds if necessary --seem appropriate. It will never be less costly to retrofit and make all state and local government buildings energy efficient. Cost of everything but solar and wind (due to technological advances) may increase if copper and other metals, concrete, and plastic are required.

This is crucial for setting an example to be emulated in the private sector and by other slow adoptive states.

Goal is too low. Need a more aggressive goal.

again, see my comment on #CC-6 above. Go for a higher standard!

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

not enough of a reduction.

more just words

Expedite this target. With implementation of the programs mentioned above, this target can be met sooner.

Cost effectiveness?

the state has done a lot over the past several decades to be more efficient. those programs should be continued

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

OK if done within existing budget.

50% below 1990 levels by 2020.

Holcim supports the State's efforts to demonstrate leadership by establishing a target for reducing its own GHG emissions.

greater than 5%

How about 80% reduction?

targets are ok but no statutes

reduction of hot air in helena would be a place to start.