

**CC-7.2 Comments**  
**Recommendation 57**  
**Climate-neutral bonding**

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

What is 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.

uncertain

What does "climate-neutral bonding" mean?

????

No opinion

Hmm - very good.

Not knowledgeable

Green House Gases are not causing the present climate change

Socialism.

What if Yellowstone Caldera erupts?

Remove the subsidies, and bonds won't be required.

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

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.

huh?

Lost on this one.

Sounds good - wonder what it means.

Financing new initiative is key!

?

What is it?

don't know this one

What???

What is this?

?

???

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.

Hopefully if everything else here is implemented, then this won't be needed.

Garbage

This is just another layer of analysis

NO FOR ALL ABOVE REASONS

Will do nothing to help and will only drive costs up.

I have no idea what this is.

what's this

over my head

Don't know what this means.

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

I don't know what this means

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

There are enough regulation of who we can and can't purchase products for the state from with out limited it to like minded people instead of looking for the lowest price product of the best quality. Spending my money wisely is governments job. Not take the responsibility upon their shoulders for a problem that may not be a problem at all, and And when 95% of the source of CO2 are not man and man can at best only eliminate 5% of the CO2 if we all left for another planet. I don't think 1,000,000 out of 301,000,000 is going to have much effect either. It is good political speech, but short on substance.

A scam for the guilty.

no such thing

I don't understand this. If it doesn't clearly help, I'm not in favor of it. We have too many recommendations already. Let's pick the ones that we really believe will make a difference and start with those.

What?

???

con games

don't know what this is

More pablum.

I am not sure what this terms means. If it has to do with planting a tree to offset ones carbon footprint then there are some flaws in the concept. One being it takes along time for a tree to mature and the problems are developing faster than a tree grows.

Unclear.

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.

??

This sounds like more junk science!

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

You will never get all the people and ideas to bond. People in Montana are individules ... not followers.

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.

What is Climate Neutral Bonding? This is really beginning to sound a lot like politically liberal Gibberish.

Sounds vaguely sexual. Do you really expect us to read all the gobbledegook you pass off as information?

?

IF this bonding means, buying around the regulations, I'm against it.

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.

corrupt idea to steal using the carbon credit system.

The whole country is broke and in debt trillions of dollars.

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

No.

I'm afraid to ask what the heck this is??

sounds ok but is it cost effective

What does this mean?

Need more information

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

?????

and more

Need to explain this one.

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

"Climate-neutral" is an imprecise term. Reducing GHGs is not a climate-neutral act; it just happens to be a positive act in terms of our ever-dynamic climate.

Once again, without any detail,, how can i form an opinion about "Climate-Neutral Bonding"???

too expensive

???