

ES-13 Comments
Recommendation 25
CO2 capture and storage or reuse (CCSR) in O&G operations, including refineries and coal-to-liquids operations

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

Government meddling/incentives rarely result in progress. Montana should be working to remove barriers to progress not impeding them by adding bureaucracy that adds no value to the end product. Furthermore, this report was based on a politically correct directive which assumes there is a man-made climate crisis. While this assumption has the backing of the media and politicians it has little support from the scientific community. Hence the reporting by the media of the relative minority that support the theory.

Technology should be able to stand on its own merits without government incentives.

Long term storage of CO2 is not fully understood and should not be pursued until it is.

Technology is not yet available.

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.

Where's the science regarding what happens to CO2 once you "capture" it and keep it for a long time?

If the captured CO2 could be reused somehow, that would be good.

Because I am convinced that CO2 levels follow natural warming and cooling cycles of the earth instead of causing warming and cooling of the earth this legislation just spends more of my tax money for nothing. I maintain that if you try to refute my convictions with actual data you too will become convinced of my convictions. Check out the temp and CO2 charts for yourself.

This is a last effort. The focus of emission reduction should be the development of non-emitting renewable sources, not old technologies with a new face.

Algae will do it.

The state cannot assume that enhanced oil recovery will be the same as geologic sequestration of CO2. It is essential that the state have regulations, and provisions to verify and enforce that CO2 is being sequestered and not moving or changing the geologic chemistry in a manner that contaminates groundwater or escapes back into the air.

If applied to new facilities only

What?

The companies will do this, if the subsidies they currently receive for bad behavior are removed. The market will handle it, if the market truly is free.

I don't support this technology.

No CTL.

"Clean" coal. ...coal liquefaction at what are commonly referred to IGCC plants, usually accompanied—at least rhetorically—by carbon sequestration. Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle plants burn somewhat cleaner and can more easily separate out the CO₂ so that it can be injected underground. This is how coal companies justify their continued existence.

But where are the IGCC plants adjoined by working sequestration operations? Good luck finding them. IGCC technology is substantially more expensive than traditional coal plants. Sequestration, which is highly speculative, adds another 30-60 percent to the cost, along with huge new demands for energy and water. Meaningful commercialization and deployment are likely decades away. Even if that bright day arrives, "clean coal" still involves the environmental devastation of coal mining, the generation of substantial mercury and particulate pollution, and a per-kilowatt energy costs no better than wind and far worse than energy efficiency. <http://www.tomp>

It should be absolutely unacceptable to build any new generation facilities without capture and storage.

stay away from coal

We need to study the impacts of carbon capture programs; it is not yet clear what the geological impact of CO₂ storage will be.

This technology is still on the drawing board.

No technology - no worky!

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 it's job. Like most government involvement in an issue, it is well intentioned, but will ultimately make the situation more cumbersome and expensive.

Yeah, it's unworkable baloney to talk about permanent capture, but make 'em work on it anyway.

WRONG APPROACH

Why waste monies on "amulets" against the global warming hoax? I believe in global warming as part of a natural, recurrent, cycle. Montana has better use for intellectual capital than GHG [non sense] "mitigation".

Deny coal to liquid use and applications

Clean Coal is an oxymoron!

Not necessary.

The sooner the better

Stupid.

\$5 gas a thing of the past?

If there's a market.

There are no details provided and there remain too many unanswered questions about CO₂ capture and its potential legal and environmental consequences for this state to embark on any legislated programs. At what cost, creating what price for a gallon of gas?

really must look holistically at all impacts, both positive and negative, for all energy production

No more coal use!! In favor of better methods of refining.

coal to liquids is quite dubious from a GHG standpoint - does not merit support

Coal-to-Liquid is a useless and wasteful technology, which should not be supported by the state legislature under any circumstances.

CO2 capture has more negatives than positives.

Solely for the industrial purposes such as enhanced oil recovery.

There are too many unanswered questions about CO2 capture. We need to wait until there are more answers about this issue before Montana does anything with this.

May be economically unfeasible.

This is not necessary

Again, there is not enough understood about long-term storage of CO2. Reuse efforts could be promising?

This will raise costs to consumers...NO, NO, NO

We need to move away from coal!!

I don't believe this is necessary at this time.

Not until I know more specifics. Too many pie in the sky proposals that take attention away from conserving energy and using renewable sources. (Coal and wood are NOT renewable.)

Again, to be paid for by the taxpayers and/or end users.

Keep it cost effective. All of these directives all place obstacles in the way of the US becoming free of oil dependency and then government wonders why we are oil dependent. Placing too many restrictions- we need to ease into it all.

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

Must be contingent on available workable technology

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

Nature or rather God has already instituted a capture and storage or reuse operation. It is trees and oceans. The Plus side of the increase of CO2 is that plants, tree, and our green lawns has prospered. Because CO2 is a non pollutant. The current level of CO2 is 1/10 that of what the Government mine safety regulations call unsafe levels.

Restrict the standards to the point that it is not feasible to do business in Montana.

This could make these companies leave the state. Again, only good with incentives, not permits or legislation.

Is it cost effective, does it support local economy or does it hurt locally owned business???

Sequestration is not a good solution because it still allows companies to pollute

At least look at doing it and determine the cost of such a plan.

Resuse is ok capture is not possible or too dangerous.. Again limit carbon emissions don't capture it.

There is no such thing as "Clean Coal"; even with CCSR, the effects of coal mining are an externalized cost that is extremely difficult to mitigate.

It's a great idea, if its possible...and economically feasible.

Again, an international issue

conservation and renewables, NOT further investment in fossil fuels

Need to have a good technology not a thrown together no one knows if it will work.

No NEW Coal

Do not support storage of CO2. Long term outcome not known nor identified.

We should not do anything with Coal to liquids, period. Invest this money in wind and solar.

This technology has so far to go and is so economically penalizing that it would be foolish to put requirements into print at this stage.

This should not be viewed as a long term answer.

we don't know if it can be done so why legislate it.

Fuel costs are high enough already.

Keep this topic on the agenda, but be wary of pinning much hope on it.

raises cost

Let's get away from coal altogether.

Besides carbon dioxide not being a pollutant, there exists no cost effective technologies to accomplish this goal. Thus, what is the cost associated with this concept and who ultimately will end up paying the costs?

CO2 is not a problem and does not need capturing.

As long as the percentages not unattainable or taxes on industry do not go up.

Encourage CCSR without imposing new costs. Let carbon tax be the financial driver.

Is this possible?

I strongly oppose any new coal plants, including coal to liquids plants. Let's focus all our energies on solar, wind, and geothermal.

If we really care about future generations of our childrens children we will stop creating problems that will affect them. We are so short sighted.

Possible to do if reasonable for companies.

We don't know if capture and sequestration even works and it hasn't been entirely proven needed.

If they are existing operations yes, if they are new coal to liquid operations see above comment.

Emphasis should be on alternative energy sources, not on O&G & coal

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.

Unproven technologies here - invest in the proven technologies wind/solar.

Cost, cost, cost! Who will pay for this? How will the citizens of this county pay for this?

This recommendation will likely lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers. See responses for ES 5 and ES 12.

Way too costly.

No more fossil fuels. Seriously.

On whos property do they intend to store this product? Who will make this decision ... the people or government? I'll let you figure that one out.

JUNK SCIENCE!!!

This farce of CO2 gas and Greenhouse gas do not need to be regulated. The State should have better things to..

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.

vague

If you can find a use for the CO2, fine. Forget any relationship to global warming. It doesn't exist

Implement in existing plants.

Do you people actually think you are in charge? God help us.

NO!!! NO>>>MORE>>>COAL! Out of the question. Invest in renewables.

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!

again, spending funds on fossil fuel systems

Fine, if not government run. Free markets work.

Would it be cost effective for the consumer if established refineries were included?

We should move away from using coal, a fossil fuel, asap.

?????

Leave the coal in the ground until technology is in place that will insure mining and refining it will not cause pollution problems

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.

Sounds really significant and profoundly important.

We currently have alternatives with zero GHG emissions, CTL is a step in the wrong direction.

Why catch CO2? because it's easier than solving the real problem which is mercury emissions.

The transportation sector provides the greatest opportunity for energy savings and reduction of GHG. I strongly support all of the transportation sector recommendations, and consider them to be achievable.

If CO2 can be used in place of water, this could be a plus. Need more study to verify CO2 will remain sequestered. Cannot be stored in coal seams that are used for water aquifers.

It would make sense to capture CO2 and use that compressed gas to power a turbine to produce additional energy. But the capture and transportation of CO2 may consume more energy and produce more CO2 than is captured producing a net loss.

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

Not there yet. See what develops.

Same as ES-12. If economics make sense it will be done without State interference.

CTL should not be pursued as an alternative energy source.
Joke, right??

Not needed.

If it can be done, yes.

Zero emissions or no ability to do so

Again, stop looking at coal as the answer.

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.

But I am against coal to liquid technology

This is a dangerous, risky operation. You don't know what will happen. We need to get away from coal. No more coal, never again.

may be a waste of time and energy

If you reduce the O & G demand then there is less of a need to C & S & R it.

providing this methodology does not limit the development/implementation of alternative solutions

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

YES!!!!

Reuse but not capture and storage.

great as long as the technology is available. We shouldn't discourage projects because of a lack of technology but embrace projects with an eye to regulating and requiring technology as it becomes available

Another new technology that still needs a lot of work.

very costly

Sure this off the shelf technology, we all use it. I have a carbon storage facility at my house.

Coal to Liquids needs stringent standards to ensure that CO2 is captured and controlled. These technologies are all far in the future and unrealistic. This should not be a priority.