

**RCII-1 Comments**  
**Recommendation 1**  
**Demand-side management programs, efficiency funds and requirements**

Too costly for the average household income in MT.

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.

Costs for both of these ideas will be passed on to the consumer in some way.

There should be a cost/benefit analysis required.

Montana has a poor average income and the economy is not well diversified.

The benefits do not justify the costs using sound science.

There are also many synergies between existing industries and developing alternative energy industries. The state should look to promote synergies. For instance, using produced water for agriculture or biofuels source water or generating electricity from co-produced geothermal (i.e., generating electricity from water produced from deep oil or gas wells using microturbines), etc.

I do not support Montana having a requirement to use a % of renewable energy unless that energy is priced similarly to traditional energy sources. Montanans can't afford it. If federal subsidies make it affordable through subsidies, we pay for those through our taxes and risk having the subsidy pulled at any time.

Compliance with the USB mandate has not been uniform across all Montana utilities. Most USB activities have occurred in NWE territory.

I would prefer that the requirement be 100% renewable by 2025.

An explanation of exactly what this means to the individual customer would be helpful. Without that information, I don't know how to respond to this item under possible solutions. I assume we're supposed to respond to the possible solutions?

Emphasis should be on actual, measurable reductions of CO2 emissions annually.

The Utilities should capture 100% of its energy by 2025, period. Regulation should play the role of making it cost prohibitive to do otherwise.

I feel strongly that we should make every effort to exceed the 20% load from renewable resources by 2020. The current MT renewable portfolio standard puts us on track for 15% by 2015; given the mounting evidence that global climate change is occurring at a faster rate than originally predicted, certainly apparent in MT, I feel it is imperative that we work for more stringent requirements for energy production which will cut greenhouse gas emissions at a rate higher than this target (e.g., 15% by 2015, 20% by 2020)

I fully support increasing the percentage of power from renewable resources but I don't see how expanded USB programs support that goal. I am against significantly increasing the size of government agencies to meet these goals.

The above examples only add to government bureaucracy. I do feel that the requirements to increase the percentage of renewable energy is a great thing but why an increase in the complicated bureaucracy

Sounds like another tax on producers which will increase cost of production and reduce production.

Renewable energy is not fuel efficient

Let the market decide.

This needs to be rewritten to remove the ambiguity in content creating a more readable document for the general public.

Free market should drive changes.

Any increase in USBP will be passed on directly to the ratepayer.

How do you propose to do this with the difference in size of rural co-ops? One size or blanket statement does not fit all utilities in Montana. What about propane suppliers are they subject to USB payments?

The Climate Change issue is only a consensus of opinions, not a proven fact. If any legislation is passed at this time it will lead to breaking the taxpayers (citizens) and the Nation. So far, it is all a hoax on the citizens by officials with hopes to profit. There is education that can be done to assist citizens to do their part without breaking the State, Nation, and taxpayers.

The Climate Change issue is only a consensus of opinions, not a proven fact. If any legislation is passed at this time it will lead to breaking the taxpayers (citizens) and the Nation. So far, it is all a hoax on the citizens by officials with hopes to profit. There is education that can be done to assist citizens to do their part without breaking the State, Nation, and taxpayers.

We really need for there to be an incentive to move toward renewable resources

I work for montana dakota utilities. I strongly believe its time for this!!

No "Demands". Contrary to public myth, the science IS still out on the extent that man is involved in climate change. Let's not burden our entire economic system so.

These percentages are a minimum. Strive for more.

to not have utilities research and INVEST in renewable resources is criminal in this world of expanding resource depletion. We cannot afford as a state and a nation to ignore the fact that we WILL see an energy crisis in the next 20 years.

Good business practices should encourage this regardless of any perceived impact on climate.

I would support a higher percentage of renewable energy sources (perhaps 30%), with a shorter period for compliance.

I believe strongly in conservation but feel it should be an individual choice and not mandated. Renewable Energy is too expensive and unreliable.

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

Is there enough projects in the planning stage to realistically meet this goal?

"payments" from natural gas sales, so the consumer pays again!

I believe this will increase energy costs to consumers. Creates industry confusion while efforts to curb hydro-power (a clean/green energy source) continue.

Without a reference to cost to the consumer we may end up with energy we can not afford to buy. Hydro which most of western Montana's electricity is generated from should be considered 100% renewable, which is not the case in all instances.

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.

I support it, but 20% is too low, and 2020 is too late. In twelve years, if they're only getting 20% from renewables, it will already be too late.

Utilities need to serve the public interest.

use more coal

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.

It is highly imperative that we begin immediately to seek renewable energy such as wind and solar.

This recommendation is intended to place more government control over our lives. The problem is not using less energy, but one of needing to develop more sources of energy.

If we force utilities to by renewable sources this will increase demand and supplies will increase to meet these demands. Until the demand exists there is no incentive to develop supply.

With the time frame with which we are dealing, I think that we should really be acting more aggressively, but if that's not possible, then I suppose this will have to do.

Would the percentages continue to rise? e.g. 30% by 2030. At any rate it seems that 1% renewable increase per year is too conservative given abundance of wind and solar resources in MT.

I'd like to briefly comment on the whole survey.

First, by and large I don't support most of these recommendations. For one, I'm not convinced they are necessary, and second I am most concerned over who will pay for them. Second, please don't use an online survey to gauge the sentiments of the Montana public. Thank you.

move utilities away from oil and natural gas. move them toward PV cells, hydrogen cells, and nuclear. in other words, man can make better power than any natural resource.

the renewable resources must be energy neutral or better

very doable

I do not support this kind of mandate. It artificailly tips the market by requiring energy sources that may not be available at reasonable costs and artificially drives up those costs which ultimately pass on to a captive consumer.

Strongly support conservation/efficiency efforts. Renewable resource efforts should not attempt to direct materials (e.g. wood products) away from value-added manufacturing to energy production without an equivalent increase in raw material availability.

I probably support this, but I don't understand it well enough to say for sure.

Coal is one of our leading utility suppliers, and unless the dinosaurs come back, it's non-renewable

I feel it is vital to implement non-carbon sources into the energy production picture primarily, bio-fuel and other carbon-based sources secondarily. I also believe conservation will also help immensely.

Go further.

I do not think increases in natural gas costs should offset any increases in efficiency as this will hit the average consumer pretty hard.

I'll be honest and say even if I don't fully understand each of the recommendations, I believe strongly that we must all do what we can to the fullest extent reasonably possible...some sacrifices are going to be needed...if it was easy, it would have been done by now.

its a start, but not enough

renewables are an important part of MT's economic future

all increases in payment follows to the consumer

Conservation is the cheapest and most efficient method of addressing the problem. But is is seldom talked about today compared to 20 years ago. There is NO instance where using less is not a better solution than ANY alternative. That is an indisputable fact.

Hydro generation is a renewable resource and MUST be considered so under any requirement for renewables

Many of the small utilities in MT receive much of their power from Hydro a renewable source of energy. Are they to be required to use a more expensive type of renewable simply to meet the mandate?

Nice, but impractical

general comment for whole survey: I'm not totally familiar with all these issues, so I was unequivocally enthusiastic for taking aggressive action to reduce demand and increase efficiency in energy use and production, but there are lots of ideas here and I am not sure THEY are all the most effective, and I didn't take the time to make a really nuanced response.

This is critical to stop growth of CO2 emissions, yet continue to allow population growth. Wind is our best option at present, and should be promoted.

In concert with aggressive demand side management programs, I fully believe we can meet and exceed these proposed requirements.

Is it legal to regulate a private utility on energy sources rather than on emmissions which effect the public?

Will greatly increase costs unless market driven.

I am opposed to anything that will add to the cost of energy and I believe that this proposal will do exactly that

I HAVE LIVED OFF THE ELECTRIC GRID FOR OVER 30 YEARS AND KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT ALTERNATIVE ENERGY. HYDRO IS GREAT BUT THE REGULATIONS TO ACCOMPLISH ARE AWFUL. SOLAR IS A WASTE OF MONEY, ESPECIALLY IN THE CLOUDY, SNOWY WESTERN PART OF MONTANA. LUCKY TO GET 1% WIND MIGHT WORK A LITTLE IN THE EAST AND SOME OF THE WESTERN PASSES BUT IT WON'T ADD MUCH. CERTAINLY NOT 20%. MAYBE WE WILL GET LUCKY AND A TECHNO BREAKTHROUGH WILL COME ALONG. BUT CAN'T COUNT ON IT. WE CAN SET FLEXIBLE GOALS BUT NOT REGULATIONS.

Proposed standard is minimal; we should be able to achieve better.

Minimum Standard only. Insufficient scope to deal with the rate of climate change effectively.

Overall: Thank you for doing this and making it easy to link to the report and appendices to refer to the discussion.

Demand side management should be the basis of any energy management plan: figure out what you actually need by cutting demand first. This makes sense for every energy consumer in Montana: The cheapest gallon of gas is the gallon I don't buy, the cheapest kWh is the kWh I don't have to use. Co-op members deserve the resources that USB provides, so why not make this a state-wide program run by a non-profit agency? It seems like a conflict of interest for the utilities to administer this money.

Provide tax incentives to move towards this goal, but on a recommendation basis rather than Mandate. The mandate would only serve to increase costs to consumers.

Regulate utility companies and break up monopolies

The market can do this

Twelve years for 25 per cent seems a long time for a little.

It would be great to have distributed generation with tax incentives and utility cooperation to have individual interests contributing to this renewable energy load. Subsidies and governmental cooperation will also increase the feasibility of new operations success.

The 20% standard by 202 increasing to 25% by 2025 is minimal. I'd like to see a more stringent standard.

Montana's utilities can do better!

Why is you keep finding way to keep taxing us  
if you look at the cost of this you would put out with the rest of the garbage

This will dramatically increase the cost of electricity to consumers for a make believe reason. It also makes Montana's immense coal reserves useless, what nonsense!

USBP was established for deregulation. Deregulation went away but not USBP. What will be the cost of meeting the 20% requirement to the consumer? Why establish another entity to administer a governmental program?

i don't feel qualified to vote on this, as it's much bigger than what meets the eye with all the costs associated to transform the current facilities to handle that green energy. By all means, I support the idea of using renewable energy resources, however, I'd need to see the economic impact it would have before supporting it.

I would like to see the oil and gas companies be held to more efficiency in their operations as well. Why are they allowed to freely burn off excess gas and emit fumes from their operations?

With the prices rapidly increasing, conserving natural gas is a matter the free market can handle without government involvement.

A large portion of electricity used in eastern Montana comes from North Dakota, not Montana. Not practical nor cost effective to rate payers.

This whole plan would be a number 1. I recognized some very "green" names on the list. Furthermore, I am very aware of what all the foundations push for - brainwashing, world control, and more of our hard-earned dollars being attacked to support this nonsense. NO, NO, NO SUPPORT.

This is a cookie-cutter approach that may do more harm than good in certain areas.

Why do we need a state-wide middle man? Would this not ADD cost to our currently high energy bills?

deregulation created most of these problems, go back to monopolies controlled by the PUC

Dictating to power companies where to get their power is not a free market or a free society. The founders frowned upon giving government such control over the private sector.

This was widely supported in a resolution in the last legislative session. It shouldn't just be sentiment. It should be policy.

I'm more concerned about power produced in MT, at our health and air quality expense, that goes out of state.

I do not support levies on natural gas sales, which would increase the cost of natural gas.

only if costs are feasible

In favor of increasing availability not in favor of government mandates. We should provide incentives to economically produce the resource availability before we mandate the use. Lets put the horse before the cart, not vice versa.

I would even more fully support a much higher percentage -- 80% -- of energy from renewable sources by 2020.

I don't want my tax dollars going for this control measure. Global warming is not a fact.

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.

Many of these options have more than one part and they are not always complimentary. Therefore if you rank on that you like you may also rank one that you cannot support.

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

This will only serve to drive energy prices higher than its already outrageously high prices.

Over 400 Scientists have said that Man-Made Global warming is not scientific. It's mostly caused by the sun - goes in cycles. Grants and Money goes to those who would like to global tax us, carbon tax us, more governmental bureaucracy etc.

Impossible. NIMBY attitudes will not allow the construction of wind generation plants etc. in our state.

More regulation demands bigger government which means more money spent on the upper level never working efficiently where it was intended to provide efficiency

This is an example of government lobby efforts to create and justify more government at the expense of the consuming citizens. Any mandates by the state of Montana on businesses will result in those incurred costs being passed onto the consumer.

The cost to the consumer is unknown, and we do not even know if we will have the tech. available to meet such goals. The cost must include the increase in food prices due to feed grains and food grains being diverted to the supply of energy. Montana and the Rest of the US should consider our great coal and oil reserves and Nuclear fuels.

The already inflated costs will be passed onto the consumer furthering our high fuel costs and digging deeper into the pockets of us that can't afford it.

What's the price tag?

Incentive not force gets best results

while this might create jobs even if it is a non profit entity it still comes at a cost.

Although this is laudable goal somebody pays for the UBS charges and today that is the rate payer. Once the money is put into the UBS account it can be used with legislative authority to fund any social program that is deemed progressive at the time. I don't think my electric rates should be used to subsidize others.

This is a very regressive policy. Increased costs will be passed on to customers. Those who can afford higher efficiency will purchase it. Those who can't will bear the costs.

Need to up the goal... 50% by 2020.

Although this is laudable goal somebody pays for the UBS charges and today that is the rate payer. Once the money is put into the UBS account it can be used with legislative authority to fund any social program that is deemed progressive at the time. I don't think my electric rates should be used to subsidize others.

we have the coal and should be using it. most of the air pollution come from China.

There is not enough evidenced to prove that the alternative energy is or will be available. This will be just another feel good piece of legislation with no reality to it. If energy were to be available there is no reasonable estimate of the costs.

We need to make sure that the implementation of renewable resources will be cost effective in terms of actual climate change. In other words, I hate to see the price of electricity go up without much benefit to climate change.

We need to move forward, but that plan is economically unworkable. Be realistic or you can't accomplish anything.

Is simply unattainable and unrealistic. Will drive the cost of energy beyond the low and moderate income people of Montana to light and heat their homes

Our electric cooperative already supplies about 90% of our energy from clean renewable hydropower thru BPA. Any mandate for renewables must recognize that this existing hydropower is renewable and counts toward the mandate. If not you will force Montana voters to give up access to a low cost renewable resource and replace it with a much higher cost renewable resource which makes no sense unless you happen to be the developer of one of the high cost renewable resources. Mandates usually only end up costing customers more and benefiting developers. Our cooperative is already exploring the possible development of small hydropower sites in our area without mandates because it is the right thing to do. Local coop boards know what is best for our members so stay of the way and let us do what is best for our members.

General Comment for all items: I am opposed to any state interference/regulation regarding energy or climate issues.

Because the sale of energy is regulated, regulation should include these best practices that protect consumers.

Renewable resources are a good idea, but come with a cost that we the consumers must pay. I like the general effort to increase renewables, but we need to be pragmatic about it. We need to remove the politics and acknowledge that Hydro power is renewable. We're talking about climate change and reducing carbon output. Hydropower is as good as it gets for this, yet we don't acknowledge it as renewable. Additionally, I believe that the target % that are listed are too high and will result in an undue burden on consumers...unless you allow all hydro power into that mix.

This is great in theory, but as for "in practice," what is the price-tag? As will be noted in several of my comments, the price for achieving all of these goals may be too great in terms of the benefits achieved. Monies may be better spent on other social goals as opposed to trying to reach a target that makes little or no difference in controlling CO2 emissions. Have you really costed out these proposals? You have to, if you have not already.

Although this is a positive step, I would like to see a 2015 time limit and an increase to 50%. Is this unrealistic or impossible? Just seems so necessary. I realize that communities often work better under pressure.

These timelines need to be reduced. I would like to see at least 25% from renewables by 2020.

I believe the state should control, maintain and upgrade the pipelines and transmission lines infrastructure, both intra and interstate. The state government could charge a fee much like our highway systems and ensure equal access to both large and smaller producers.

This will increase energy costs even more.

We also have to talk more openly about the progression toward depletion of natural gas, and about a scenario in which we end up leaving some of it in the ground because it will have become too little to make a real contribution.

will raise cost of energy overall

We have the technology and they have the profits to bring this timeline to 2015.

No. Not the role of state government.

I fully support the requirement for the increases in renewable energy use in utilities, but these percentages are not enough!!! The rate of the rate of temperature increase (yes, the second derivate) is extremely steep. We need more action NOW.



This is a step in the right direction but absolutely nowhere near progressive enough. We have tons of potential, but it will take a critical size of scale to make alternative power (and the associated non-pollution) cost effective or useful for our economy. Double the figures and we'll be an energy leader.

We won't solve the problem if all we focus on is energy production. Our biggest gains are to be found in conservation and other demand side opportunities.

I have read through these proposals and the problem I see is they are cost prohibitive. Let's look at biodiesel it raised the price of diesel fuel 50 cents a gallon, that was just the tip of the iceberg, it cost more to transport every thing also raised the price of all grains which increased the price of all meats, dairy, poultry and eggs, most dairy products increased by 25 to 50 percent, large grade A eggs increased from 54 cents a dozen to \$2.05 that is not a very good trade, there is a better way. In the 1970's oil crisis the government gave hundreds of millions of dollars to the auto, power and oil companies to decrease our need for foreign oil and what did we get, autos that got less mileage than they did before. What we need is to help the small inventors to get their products on the market. There are generators that can be put on a home that will supply enough power for home and put the excess into the grid. There is a system that will convert water to fuel and increase mileage from 30 to 60 percent.  
ma

renewable costs more, pollutes more, and is a scam. This is especially true of windmills and corn ethanol.

fully support 20% of utility load from renewables. not sure what you mean "capture 100% of cost effective energy"

The state already has a renewables standard. The one we have is adequate.

Example #2 - how will this be paid for??

Your study does not include costs that consumers will bear.

Need to account for side effects of renewables i.e. may take more non-renewables to produce renewables and may cause offsite problems. Corn production results in scarcity of croplands for food production, thus drive up prices for food, clothing, energy, and land values.

2020 is too far out, the need is now.

General comment--I believe in market oriented solutions with R/D and education as the cornerstone--I oppose regulatory solutions that expand the already non-efficient government.

Not reasonable in all cases

Co-ops are already heavily dependent on one of the most reliable forms of renewable energy in existence: HYDROPOWER.

All co-ops offer some type of green power product, either through direct power purchases and/or renewable energy certificates, also known as "green tags."

Proposal does not allow for needed flexibility. As not-for-profit utilities, every cost eventually flows back to the co-op consumer. Mandated RPS and mandating a one-fourth dependency on alternative renewable energy will likely significantly increase costs.

Cost to consumer?

I support this recommendation, but I'm not sure 20-25% is enough. I think the goal needs to be flexible enough to adjust that to a higher percentage if necessary.

I have concerns about this survey process. It may seem good in theory but can lend itself to manipulation. Anyone from anywhere can send in a survey or multiple surveys for that matter.

What a total waste of money!

This could add unknown costs to energy bills and make MT less competitive.

I am not familiar with USB so can give support to this HOWEVER, I fully support the goals state on the right - we can do better than this with some Federal help and I hope this is your goal too!

I think this is too little too late. The percentage should be 50% by 2020

Setting and incentivizing renewable energy goals and efficiency standards that must be met is the only way to make significant progress. Further, it ultimately beneficial to both producers and consumers.

While this recommendation is aimed at new generation facilities, MPA members are some of the largest energy users in Montana. This recommendation could add unknown costs to energy bills and make Montana less competitive with neighboring States and Provinces when making capital investment decision for new generation facilities. MPA does NOT support this recommendation for State implementation.

Should do better than 20% but should include nuclear as well as renewable resources, since nuclear energy does not contribute to global warming.

This is a necessary and logical starting point for effective immediate reductions in the GHG emissions and vital component in changing the fundamental ways we sustain our lifestyles. Energy is core to the climate change crisis and the most obvious solution to the current crisis with the environment and related concerns over fossil fuels in general can be addressed on multiple fronts by mandating renewable resource use. To not take this option first and foremost would reduce the effectiveness, relevance, and credibility of many of the other recommendations. This is a proactive solution that directly confronts the source of the climate change problem instead of simply mitigating other consequences.

I noticed the words demand. Our Forefathers fought a war to rid itself of "demand."  
I also noticed "expand universal systems." This is America and I fail to see how this is any different than the United Nations; a total failior!!

The State has too much bureaucracy now and not enough income to support this mostly socialist/communist agenda. Free enterprise is the best way to conserve. The State much demand the Fed stop destroying the dollar and control inflation.

Just who do you think is going to pay for all this? Remember, the market is very efficient. High gas and energy prices lead individuals to make the right purchase choice for energy savings. We don't need government intervention.

We just took down the Milltown Dam, now you want to build more dams?

The continued and expanded

This is feel good environmentalism. When it is cost effective then the market will dictate.

This is not a function of State Government.

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.

When have more laws ever helped. The market will solve problems but the government will only create problems.

Would like to see higher percentages sooner.

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

We are NOT a NANNY Government

This does not consider the harmful effects on the elderly and people on fixed income. We will fight this.

These programs need to be subject to a cost analysis to determine who pays and how much each requirement will cost

Renewables are expensive. Reliance on wind will require backup, probably gas. Gas should be used for home heating, not power generation. Using gas for power generation has driven up the price to residential consumers.

sooner if possible

This is an utterly inadequate goal. Much more needs to be done much sooner.

To make this simple -- I can't find much here that I would support as a matter of making it law. The one thing that is obvious about all this global warming stuff is that we don't know all that much about it -- so why are we making laws that have the weight of concrete for a millenia before we know what we are doing? Why should we extend the long arm of state government into local governments -- not something that works well in any other regard. Any thing that is truly efficient and energy saving does not need incentives or laws to force its sale. the market place will respond far more positively and rapidly than anything that government can do. And more importantly it will be free then to respond just as quickly to the next innovation, which is absolutely sure to come, if we don't have things nailed into place by arbitrary laws and regulations. Incentives and codes and laws tend to freeze us in time... given the seriousness of the situation and the rapid rate of innovation that's just about the last thing we

Good recommendation - sooner would be better.

GENERAL COMMENT, after getting about 2/3rd through.

All of these recommendations are presented as 'equal' It's really hard to estimate the relative value of each of these, in relation to relative costs? Of course, I haven't read the report, but are there some criteria you used to come up with these; some minimum ratio of benefit to cost? Can we figure one out. (I will read report now).

Didn't receive any information regarding your survey prior to 2/28. I think you could have done a better job in this regard.

We can do better than 20% renewable resources. How bout 75%? 20% is not enough.

Cheaper and more economical approach is to burn coal cleanly using the latest in technology. A program will not end drought in Montana. More severe droughts have occurred in the last 1000 years before GHG increases...the most recent being the 1930s.

I would like to see a larger percentage of load from renewable resources by 2020 and 2025. I think it is achievable.

Let's address something economically realistic. "20 by '20" is focusing on more ethanol use, more wind generation ... programs that take more energy than they create and/or need more reliable energy sources to back them up.

The way this is written makes it almost impossible for even a well-educated college professor to understand let alone respond. I am in favor of the most stringent controls on carbon emissions that you can come up with and willing to pay for them.

Should be a higher percentage from renewables

Another layer of bureaucracy? Who's going to pay for it?

Costs are not included in any of these, so I voted without regard to their eventual cost. This is a problem, because cost-benefit is a big part in deciding which measures to implement.

Not totally opposed, but not enough details to evaluate. How effective are DSM's? Have they actually resulted in net energy savings? The term "100% of its achievable cost-effective energy efficiency" needs to be carefully defined. Whose and what costs are included? How are these costs calculated? Different types of renewable energy have different GHG emissions and different energy efficiencies. For example, how do the biofuels compare to wind energy? Before adoption of the 25% requirement, more information needs to be known about each renewable energy source and which sources are being considered. What are the affects of each renewable energy source on GHG? Does replacement of electricity generated from coal with energy from biofuels reduce GHG? These questions point out the lack of sufficient information necessary to provide appropriate responses to not only this one, but many of the recommendations.

I would like to see each utility to meet 50% of its load from renewable resourced by 2012 increasing to 75% by 2020.

All this will do is trickle down to the consumer. Aren't we bearing most of the load now?

2020 is not acceptable...much sooner

I don't have time to take this survey. I support the State of Montana following the recommendations of the climate plan. I support the State addressing global warming. Studies that I am aware of show that taking these kinds of steps save consumers money. Thank you for allowing me to comment in this way.

Can we shorten these time frames.

I hope it is not too little too late--I realize it takes time to implement such programs--but 12 years, after we have just lost 8 years to any reasonable green growth, will make it 20 years! I am not sure this is sufficient...

I feel the cost of energy is only going to increase. We need to take advantage of our relatively cheap energy now to invest in development in renewable resources for the future.

While this recommendation is aimed at new generation facilities, MPA members are some of the largest energy users in Montana. This recommendation could add unknown costs to energy bills and make Montana less competitive with neighboring States and Provinces when making capital investment decisions for new generation facilities. MPA does NOT support this recommendation for State implementation.

20 percent is an arbitrary number. What are the sources? Is biomass from timber one? Does hydro count as renewable supply? Is anything going to be done to ensure that wind permitting doesn't get tied up by eco-morons? And what the heck is Demand Side going to do except intrude government policy into people's lives? Sorry, this isn't the USSR

Each utility should capture 100% of its cost effective energy

Let the free market economy take its course. Government demands are based on a premise that has not taken fully into consideration the full impact of sun activity variations and climate changes. Let this last year's data be used as an example of how the sun's relative inactivity influences the overall temperature of the earth, i.e. an average decrease in the global atmospheric temperature lowest since 1966.

I oppose legislation that mandates extreme conservation measures to be taken in a blanket policy. Our electric cooperatives are not set up to be able to fund such a mandate, and a statewide supplier would not work in Eastern Montana.

I think we can do better.

These kind of arbitrary mandates ignore the complexities of our supply/demand economic system. Meeting these mandates would punish low income Montana families by unreasonably escalating rates for most utilities, many of which are rural coops. There are a lot of low income families in MT because MT has the lowest average annual wage per job in the nation along with SD. MT also ranks in the upper percentiles among states for number of jobs per worker that is needed to survive. Even working at two or more jobs, total income per worker is still way below the National average (US Dept. of Commerce, Bur. of Economic Analysis). Montanans simply cannot afford more State Government bureaucracy and spending that increases taxes and cost of living. Finally there is no need for these arbitrary mandates. Natural oil and gas resources are not "fossil fuels". Instead hydrocarbons are continuously cooked, trapped by impervious layers of rocks, and condensed and stored in porous layers in geologic dome structures.

I worry that government money going to specific renewable resources will impede the progress of development of other, perhaps better, resources.

We should be as efficient as we can, but it's pretty hard to have a concrete number on exactly what demands will be 18 years from now. Have a little flexibility to deal with the unforeseen!

This makes no sense as a one size fits all has horrible economic consequences unless existing hydro is considered renewable. To have Western Cooperative's back off hydro to incorporate "renewable" would cost consumers millions per year. To require the utility to capture cost effective renewable is akin to requiring a gas station to pay for upgrades to large 4 X 4 vehicles to improve mileage.

wind power in excess of 15% places an instability on the grid creating a need for peak power costs if power is available to meet demand.

Essential step

what percentage do Japan, Germany, and France demand of their utilities? Is 20% actually attainable based on present knowledge and technology?

I understand this is possible and I feel it can be done

Natural gas prices continue to increase and resources are limited. MT has thousands of units of affordable housing w/poor insulation, glazing and inefficient furnaces/boilers at present there are no demand side USB incentives available to encourage energy conservation retrofits. Insulation incentives should continue and furnace and window replacement added. State tax (credit) incentives should be available.

I would like to see this energy used in Montana and not sent to Canada and surrounding states.

My only reservation in supporting this measure is that it is TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE. I'd like to see it at a much higher percentage sooner.

the renewable resources processing must be proven to reduce CO2 emissions.

Work with PSC to assist all energy providers in state including REA Coops to use aggressive investment in conservation and efficiency as part of supply efforts.

NO BACKGROUND IN THIS AREA

Yes. We need to move!

Utilities are not going to change on their own--they will need mandates. The question of whether or not subsidies/incentives are needed for the change is open to debate. If I were an industry, I would lobby for incentives/subsidies simply because the money might be available and I'm already paying a lobbyist to represent me.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.  
Don't need another level of oversight and regulation

I like the idea of a non-profit entity. This is not enough of a percentage reduction. Please see "Rosey Revisited" at [Globalwarmingsolutions.org](http://Globalwarmingsolutions.org)

These seem to be good objectives, but be careful how they are packaged. Simply issuing mandates without considering costs and implementation feasibility are not a good idea.

Do we realistically have enough projects in the planning/permitting phases to meet this goal? Hydro should be included in the list of "renewable energy sources". Does expanding the USB mean adding fees to my gas bill?

the coal proposals that are floating around miss the point and in my opinion going in the absolute wrong direction.

Don't support such mandates. Renewables are unreliable and costly. Take care of citizens -- especially the poor and those on fixed incomes -- by supporting the lowest cost electric power generation.

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

Expensive government programs should NOT be expanded. This would result in a double hit to the consumer in increased tax and gas suppliers costs being passed to consumer.

great idea but could snowball into a money pit for the utilities, especially non-profit co-ops. 20% renewable might be difficult to achieve when the no-good environmentalist continue to stonewall windfarm projects because they "affect integral vistas." Either we have wind development or we don't. It isn't pretty, but neither are blackouts.

I would support higher % targets for renewables

Unfortunately, "...capture 100% of its cost effective energy" is badly worded. How many people actually understand that, as written? And why is the recommendation for utilities to use renewables to meet 20% of their electricity production by 2020 and 25% by 2025 lumped under "Demand Side Management"?

greater than 20% from renewable

I think these should be stronger and faster.

The "Final Report" is BLANK!!! How am I supposed to make an informed opinion when the information is not available??

2025 will be too late. Action should have started yesterday. Make requirements as stringent as possible.

This will be difficult due to transmission constraints

Too expensive. Will raise utility bill, harming low income Montanans.

How much more cost can consumers absorb?

More taxes on natural gas, set up a government entity to supply gas to everyone, require companies to use renewable energy despite any economic benefit and then pass it on to the consumers. Why don't we just take over the utilities set up a government entity to run them and while we at it we should just nationalize everything since only the government can run a business right.

Renewable resources are extremely important. Are these goals strong enough?

Need to provide equity. There are few incentives for coop customers to install renewable energy systems.

This is the least we should require!

\*Proposal does not allow for needed flexibility, removes local control of power supply decision-making that has been the hallmark of co-ops historically stable power rates.

\*All co-ops offer some type of green power product, either through direct power purchases and/or renewable energy certificates, also known as "green tags". Some co-ops meet the intent of the standard by socializing green tag costs among all members.