

RCII-10 Comments
Recommendation 10
Industrial energy audits and recommended measure implementation

Who pays for this. Private will change if cost effective.

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.

need agricultural goal and public building goal as well

Let us get very serious about Industrial Energy use in this state. If are truly going to see a change it has to happen on this level. I am not in favor of tax incentives to lower carbon output. How much will this 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.

We pay these taxes. I reiterate my stance that only simple, affordable improvements are warranted.

Why only 10 percent?

I don't support using tax breaks to achieve social goals. It is much more cost efficient to provide low interest loans or some other incentive.

10% is not enough. It should be at least 20% by 2020.

Need to help industry realize the economic benefits.

and consequences for inefficiency

Would support a higher reduction in energy use. Many industries have upgraded to higher efficiencies and saved money in the process.

EXXON is already making well beyond, no tax incentives until they implement 50% of new energy infrastructure in renewables. Not coal, not nuclear, renewable energy = solar, wind, thermal.

Let the cost of power provide the incentive.

Goal should be greater than 20%.

Programs have existed for decades. Let the market do its thing.

Manufacturers should be self funding their efficiency improvements. Tax incentives should be structured to go above and beyond not just meet the minimums. Industry has to carry it's share.

10% is too little.

10% is WAY too little. Industry is a huge problem with climate change issues, they should be investing in the societies that they are benefiting off of.

How about 10 years sooner?

This should not be the main focus of the incentive program; instead you should focus upon educational programs (it is in the best interest of a business to become more energy efficient).

I'm not an industrial user but I like the approach!

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

Should be a higher reduction

With the high cost of energy, don't you think "industry" already makes day to day decisions about energy use?

Yes to incentives. No to mandates or other punitive measures.

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. They will do it on their own if it impacts the bottom line.

Just 10%? That seems like far too little of a change. Reductions of 20% or more would be more effective.

Instead we should have made it mandatory that they reduce their energy use not provide tax incentives for them to do so.

Use tax incentives for socially positive purposes, not to let corporations take your money to Gran Cayman banks and pay no taxes on it.

Let the free market decide.

Too little too late. How about 15% by 2015? At least for existing industry. If there is major growth in industrial output, then allowance for that may be necessary.

This should include a BAN on Coal Fired Power Plants. Coal is the leading contributor to green house gas.

Unnecessary.

Make it 25% by 2018

In addition to incentives, I'd like to see more enforcement and fines imposed for those who do not meet industrial energy improvements and standards. I'd rather have businesses who choose not to make progressive choices that improve our state incur the cost of moving elsewhere than stay here and continue to pollute our state and citizens.

Again, I favor efforts are concentrated on incentivizing change rather than legislating compliance or targets. Incentivize consumers (demand-side) and all desired (supply-side) goals/targets will be met -- and then some -- in short order. After MT's "deregulation" fiasco, both commercial and residential consumers are anxious to exact due revenge on the power monopolies. Simply give them a fair opportunity to do so and they will.

you should not be rewarded for doing the right thing. companies should never receive tax incentives for anything.

Credits should be given, perhaps, for increased usage of renewables like wind and solar energy. 10% reduction should be higher, and then credit should be given for increased renewable usage. 10% is pretty low it seems.

Should be funded by the industries, directly or indirectly.

ok if not a mandate

I think we should be really careful with this one. There should be a specific list of improvements that are eligible for the incentive. And require proof. I don't like the idea of some big businesses getting MORE tax incentives just because they have really good accountants who know how to manipulate data to their advantage.

If it's cost-effective, industry will find it by itself

Make it sooner, in the next 10 years - by 2018

they should be doing this without incentives, as it is a cost savings for the industries AND the consumers alike. why should consumers be footing more tax load for large business?

Yes. Like this.

While you do this, subsidize organic farms and stop subsidizing farms that use pesticides and lots of chemical fertilizers. Only 10,000 medium sized farms changing to organic methods would result in CO2 reduction equivalent to removing over a million vehicles from the highways. Imagine what changing large farms could do.

10% is a pittance! This should be much higher with incentives provided (tax breaks?) for those who comply above and beyond the minimum...

we need specific carbon reduction caps here

Should this be 20%?

After the incentives will come mandatory government programs. The marketplace will take care of these issues.

Carrots or Sticks?

Industry has to lead by example.

As long as they are real and not supporting necessary retooling or upgrades that should be part of doing business.

only as a voluntary program

Very good idea if incentives are provided.

Sounds good at first blush, but maybe this is just another way to benefit a few corporations at the expense of the rest of us?

No mandated audits. Voluntary only.

AUDIT AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ALL YOU LIKE. IF IT MAKES SENSE WE WILL DO IT.

Reduction should be targeted at fossil fuel energy use. After all, renewable energy use is not a direct environmental harm.

Saving energy should be incentive enough because of the energy costs recouped, especially if RCII-9 is implemented. Industrial tax incentives are often abused.

These are usually abused by the beneficiary.

Industry should reduce industrial energy greater than 10% by 2020.

Consider the amount of heat that is lost through smoke stacks, chimneys and vents...why not put this wasted energy to good use?

The market should provide them with enough incentive

there must be a way other than tax incentives.

reduce energy more & more quickly

Only 10%? It is a start, but could be more.

Make this percentage higher!

Why do they need incentives? The beneficiaries of incentives have abused this method. Saving energy should be incentive enough.

this just cost we the people more on every thing we use

We do this currently. It is important to keep in mind that industrial users have been doing energy audits for years and getting tax credits for reduction investments.

Just 10%, that's not much of an expectation.

why so little and taking so long?

Who will pay for the incentives? Why not let the improvements pay for themselves?

As long the cost to industry is recoverable through the incentive program and not passed along to the consumer. Energy conservation is fine, but not for junk science sake.

how will we fund all these incentives? billings is REALLY suffering as it is with too little of a tax base to continue maintaining, let alone improving.

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

Who is going to pay? Industry? Make that "consumers."

I only support this if other industry/corporate welfare programs are removed to cover the tax-payer cost of this program.

those incentives are all ready there, You will not be satisfied till there are no more industries left in this country

If you're going to give some businesses' taxes back, just distribute that total amount to everyone. The founders taught that it was in improper thing for government to try to be a positive force, because it does everything by FORCE!

Should we not regulate rather than incentivize?

How can you "reduce industrial energy use by 10%" and still promote economic growth and improved wages.

only if it does not put companys at a competitive risk,loss of jobs,company shutting down

What are the alternatives? Sounds great to reduce energy use, but how are you going to do it. We need the technology before we require businesses to comply with requirement. Encourage technology development through incentives and if they become cost-effective to implement, then require industries to use them.

Why not %50 or %80! Industry can do better!

10% is quite a low goal -- I believe it should be set much higher.

Let the free market dictate the energy use reductions of industry. What does a bureaucrat know about industrial energy consumption needs?

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.

I hope this means reducing individual site usage, not a total reduction which could be accomplished by regulating some business out of existence

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

Tax incentives are effective rather than adding costs.

The goal to reduce industrial energy use has merrit, and combined with incentives for new industry here in Montana will ultimatley produce value to Montana and our citizens.

Who will pay the incentive--the consumer--taxpayer. Government has not money, produces no product, Instead of of a tax incentive consider that the real incentive is that the corporations be allowed to make a profit, by reducing energy, as prices rise, thus producing a great benefit in a shorter peroid of time. How many times have stated goals had to be changes because technology could not meet the goals.

Only if voluntary in nature and repay back to the state in some form for taxes forgiven. It does no good to give away tax dollars and have the state or local government receive no benefit. Will this harm our schools and counties because of reduced taxes into the general fund?

Increase the incentive based on the percentage of energy saved.

It depends on whether local and state business can afford to install the 'energy efficient improvements' These incentive can sound good but be an actual curse to business in MT

Industry already works hard to reduce its energy use; it's simply good business.

Anything that reduces taxes is good,

Great idea! We are essentially saying that we will reward you for helping us. I think that you will have a much more positive response if it is a choice rather than being forced to make changes.

While the goals are great the last thing I want is someone from the government that is here to help me. Let it come from the private sector not some bloated state agency

With the cost of energy going up this is already happening.

While the goals are great the last thing I want is someone from the government that is here to help me. Let it come from the private sector not some bloated state agency

should not need incentives

So what happens if the tax incentives do not work? Then is it mandatory???? Be more definitive here.

I like the idea of incentives to help get people to understand and address energy efficiency.

I like the idea of tax incentives, but is the 10% reduction economically possible? We don't want to wreck our economy by setting artificial and unrealistic goals.

They should and will do this to save themselves money

Market forces will drive this better than any big brother legislation.

only if you provide tax incentives for everyone. I am tired of subsidizing corporations in this country. They have no conscience nor do they have a value standard. The bottom line is all that is watched. I suggest you read Natural Capitalism and use the capitalistic process only if it is rooted and strongly based in the survival of life systems.

seems like 10% energy reduction is too modest. Can the requirement be raised?

I am not sure tax incentives are the answer, but certainly all corporations should comply with energy efficiency programs. Perhaps incentives for corporations under 50 employees.

I like the incentives but don't like the mandated target.

10 % by 2020 is a joke. What kind of a difference is that going to make?!

We urgently need to reduce carbon emissions from ALL SOURCES by 80% by 2025, to have any chance to forestall the worst effects of global warming.

I am all for audits and making processes more efficient as long as it is economical for the business. I am not in favor of government mandated audits ect...

I'll believe the support from the government when I see it. From my viewpoint, you guys are talking this game, yet fighting it at the same time.

Industry has insisted that government should get out of its way. But it solicits government policy, including tax incentives that place government in industry's future. There is reason for mixed feelings about government intervention that is both resisted and solicited.

tax breaks for the rich

Again, earlier timeline and increase to 25%

Good idea. Again, the goal is set low and will therefore achieve low quality results.

Again a waste of taxpayer money.

With incentives this is a great program as long as no penalties are introduced

As long as auditing program cost don't reduce benefits from tax incentives.

at least 10%

Stress the tax incentives; no new regulations or penalties.

Get these guys on board any way we can.

If energy efficiency becomes cost efficient as well, there would be no need for tax incentives.

Reformation of state tax policy should be done because it will benefit business, foster growth, more employment, better economy and increase in tax revenues -- and that is done by reductions in general. Tax policy should not be used for social engineering.

Again, implement ASAP! Give em reason to change.

And stop using power for improving life style??

Taxes spent and new bureaucracy

Again, I would like to see some flexibility because 10% seems like a small step considering the volume of waste products produced.

Standards instead of incentives: costs for compliance shouldn't be externalized. Gov't should provide advice.

Incentives are beneficial, however, these imply mandatory compliance. In addition, energy sector has been implementing energy audits for decades.

Yes. Tax incentives work well and would save energy in the important industrial sector.

And I guess, tax penalties for those who don't.

We approve of the use of incentives. This recommendation has target goals that suggest they are mandatory. It also assumes that the industrial sector has not been involved in energy audits which would not be correct. The industrial sector has been involved in energy consumption audits for many years.

Here is that word 'recommend' again. The citizenship must understand that government recommendations lead to a future of absolute control.

Tax cuts are fine, but should not be used to control people or promote some idea.

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.

Only 10%?! This should be much higher.

Oh boy! Corporate welfare. You might even get Bill Gates to sign on to this one. What a croc.

Too little too late. Should be 50% by 2020.

This is non of government's business. Those who govern the best, govern the best!

To reduce energy use you increase costs to consumers.

This distorts the free market model. If savings are available, businesses will make the adjustment.

the reduction number should be a minimum of 25%

Incentives? More cost to the taxpayer?

10% is not enough. Industry can do better.

Pathetically low goal.

Industry strives to lower it's costs. This will only create more beaucery necessary to administrate it.

Rewards for those who exceed goal.

Aren't incentives already inplace for energy-efficiency improvements?

Please do better than 10% - that won't make any difference.

Let high energy costs motivate industry to do audits on their own.

Tax incentives seem ok. Regulatory requirements I would not support.

I am not sure on this one. Some of the energy conservation measures industry could take would provide longterm rewards anyway. If it was limited to upfront equipment purchase or modification It might be ok.

If we start now by not permitting coal fired electric generating plants to be built until they can greatly reduce their emissions we might be a little ahead of the pollution game. It makes no sense to condone pollution when we are trying to reduce it !

Can't we aim for more than 10%. Aren't we letting these offenders off easily by giving them a tax incentive to do it? Can't we require more?

Increasing energy costs already drive well managed businesses to do this. The government doesn't need to mandate it.

makes goods and services more expensive and depending on the measures taken only causes minor improvements.

I am currently trying to reduce the costs of plant operation yet it continues to rise, please tell me how to afford to replace motors which are new equipment to reduce operating costs. How do I afford to Re-insulate a recently insulated building? Would you like me to send our jobs overseas too? Tax incentives have no interest to me.

There has to be some incentives for industry to want to develop better procedures and processes.

Why is there a need for tax incentives, if energy efficiency is to become cost efficient?

Many industries are already responding to the increasing energy costs. This will happen without state's involvement.

This is huge, reducing industrial energy use would be fantastic!

Excellent.

Tax credits are a great vehicle for promoting energy efficiency.

We approve of the use of incentives. This recommendation has target goals that suggest they are mandatory. It also assumes that the industrial sector has not been involved in energy audits which would not be correct. The industrial sector has been involved in energy consumption audits for many years.

Right. Industrial energy use has already massively declined in Montana because industry has departed thanks to stupid environmental policies (admittedly a primarily federal result) that have eviscerated our resource-production industrial base. Never mind the business equipment tax barrier to the capital-intensive, high productivity jobs that have gone ELSEWHERE. Like Idaho?

Industry will do this on their own if money is available and there are TRUE savings.

Energy efficiency is money saving and advantageous to industry; they need not receive tax incentives. Industry receives enough already.

The amount should be higher - 25% by 2020.

Can't it be done sooner than 2020??

Industry should be able to reduce its energy use by significantly more than 10%. This should have a higher priority.

In general, this supports good conservation measures. However, again, the devil can be in the details.

I think we can do better than 10% and can do it quicker than 2020. I see this as avoiding the problem rather than attempting to solve it!

This would certainly be a program to discourage or even reduce Montana's already inadequate industrial base, further reducing availability of decent jobs in Montana.

More industries will move overseas where there are no regulations, as our economy continues its downward spiral.

I think we can do much better than 10% with imagination and will.

I think this is do-able

Again, by waiting until 2020 is an excessive amount of time. We need to act sooner than later.

INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USE REDUCED BY 25% OR MORE IS NECESSARY

This is where some of the most cost effective energy savings are and reducing their taxes to lower their energy needs/costs could help retain jobs to societies overall benefit.

Let the free market figure it out.

reduce by more than 10% by 2020

With the closure of Montana's smelters, aluminum refinery, and many sawmills, we have already cut our industrial energy use too much.

incentives are ok if you have the money to implement. What happens to mom and pop in 2020 if they didn't have the funding to meet this?

Need to reduce it further and faster.

Maybe tax incentives to start, however, the money savings should make tax incentives eventually unnecessary.

Don't mandate it, make it voluntary.

Cost benefit of energy use reduction should become self-evident in a competitive business environment otherwise companies like GE would not be already involved.

Establish incentives for commercial natural gas consumers similar to the NW Energy demand side incentives for municipalities to replace inefficient motors in water/wastewater treatment plants. Also, rebates and/or tax incentives for insulation and Energy Performance Contracting.

10% reduction by 2020 is laughably small. The percentage needs to be much higher.

HOW CAN THIS BE POSSIBLE IN A WORLD WITH AN ALWAYS INCREASING POPULATION
???

Object to tax incentives. Industry has enough of these already. If prices go up - well, that's capitalism, and we all take part knowingly.

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

How about 15-20% by 2020? Demand-side improvements.

Also provide incentives for domestic energy improvement projects

This seems a reasonable objective, but you will find that industry is already working on energy efficiency - it's all dollars and sense to them. Need to get industry involved in implementing this if pursued - did not happen in CCAC and TWG. There are existing Energy Star programs for industry - review these first in carrying out this objective.

Many industries are already taking proactive steps to reduce their energy costs. While incentives are preferable to mandates, does this really need to be done. Small businesses might be a better target for incentives

It's large corporations that have slowed efforts toward local, energy efficient, humane use of energy. I fear that, like so often in the past, these incentive monies will flow to the big corporations while the little, local, industries will get little or none of this money.

Energy is expensive. Industry likes to make a profit. They will conserve energy and make the most economical choices to better their bottom line. There is no need to offer tax incentives for this. Someone else always has to pay for a tax "incentive"

Need some sort of technical support to make work. Through university system?

I am not convinced industry needs another subsidy

Industrial energy use needs to be reduced by more than 10% by 2020. How about 25%? 50%?

Support voluntary industry driven measures that include internal audits - through the use of incentives rather than mandates that require third-party verification

Does this also mean curtail any future industrial expansion in the state?

would want greater than 10%

10% is nowhere near enough.

This is one that makes some sense, let the market drive the improvements.

The concept of reducing energy use is excellent. Various conservation / augmentation programs are already in place, though, so the 10% goal may be over ambitious. CHP and other existing renewable technology should be recognized for existing facilities that are in service and not just future facilities. The forest product segment has been proactive in implementing renewable energy and our efforts to date should be recognized in any action. The baseline for considering energy reductions should be set back in time enough to recognize the early performers.

There is a lot of room for efficiency improvements in industry. Encouraging this efficiency is in everybody's best interest, since the industry saves money while reducing its energy use.

Largest users equals largest potential for savings.