

**RCII-4 Comments**  
**Recommendation 4**  
**Building energy codes**

Do not neglect that reuse of buildings is inherently efficient. Consider the "sunk energy" that exists in current buildings. Some calculations show that tearing down older structures and replacing them with modern, high efficiency structures have energy pay-back terms of 10->100 years.

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.

I strongly feel that outreach and incentives are a better way. Also, the large amount of resources needed to implement a statewide building permit program seem prohibitive.  
need to assist farmers with farm specific efficiency standards

How about an incentive for green buildings?

This plan would make it more expensive to build a house or a business building. In addition, it provides more bureaucracy. Those governmental positions will be funded at tax payer expense. The consumer ends up with more cost from both ends.

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.  
Could only support on new structures

It depends on what it will cost to reduce the amount of fossil energy input. I would support enforcement of current regulations, but not funding additional regulations.

I support this approach only if sufficient funding and staffing resources are provided to make enforcing the building code outside of cities practical.

yes, yes , yes - we need energy efficient code enforcement in rural areas!

LEED certification should be mandatory in any state building, including additions and remodeling. Tax breaks on the state level should also be awarded to businesses and homeowners for leed certification, in an amount reflective of extra capital costs for the certification.

Increase Federal Incentives for Ground Source Heat Pumps for Businesses, Homes, and Public Buildings.  
Require every new school and public building to install geothermal heating and cooling  
I support energy use related code inspections.

I would support the requirement of blower door tests and duct sealing tests as well. I think this would go a long way to holding contractors accountable for their work.

Much education needed here; builders and purchasers alike must partner together to understand that higher upfront costs to the builder(in "greener" materials and heating cooling equipment) will be passed on to the owner, but that they will recoup these costs down the road.

Building codes are too cumbersome and costly to implement. Tax breaks and credits are much more effective.

The permitting process is complicated enough--I think the above standards are good but the information about the building energy codes needs to be readily available.

Also, keep the country the country and city the city. Sprawl accounts for much energy inefficiency and reduces the open space "the commons" we all want to enjoy. Inefficient for governments to provide services well beyond borders with much infill left untouched.

The program should provide incentives rather than be coercive and punitive.

Increasing the cost of housing will only hurt the poor. There exists no factual basis for doing so.

Let the free market drive people toward energy efficiency. Passive solar and other design knowledge has been around since people lived in caves. Let people decide if they want to integrate it into their buildings.

The current self certification for compliance to the building and energy code is a FARCE!! In my experience no builder outside a jurisdiction fills out the breaker panel sticker nor do they install the measures to meet the current 2003 IECC.

This needs to start now.

76% of coal-fired electricity goes into buildings, that must change...

Only if materials do not drive up the cost.

This would eliminate competitive pressure to build cheaply and poorly, in energy efficiency terms.

While I support the ideas of codes, the cost of enforcement could be prohibitive. It could easily cost developers and builders all their profit waiting for an inspection from a State agency inspector.

could be costly to enforce especially in Montana. Education will create the momentum for this to happen.

Even if we are using non-fossil energy to heat buildings and water, it is desirable to require energy-efficient construction that will reduce consumer energy bills and overall need and costs to obtain additional energy sources.

Support increased standards for conservation; I would more fully support if inspections in the unincorporated areas were handled by county governments

I don't agree with expanding code enforcing jurisdictions to include farmers and ranchers with agricultural buildings. Otherwise I do support stronger building energy codes.

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

More government! If you want to conserve energy it should be all energy, not just "fossil" energy.

This appears to do two things -- (1) "improve" building codes, and (2) apply building codes to areas outside current code-enforcing jurisdictions. Applying building codes to areas outside current code-enforcing jurisdictions is the better first-step.

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.

Tough sell. Contractors will fight it.

I think this is critical! Here in the northern climate, we should be on the front edge of pushing energy efficient building codes.

The current permit system in Billings is not a resource for individuals, it is a process to collect fees.

Why are we still building in the same inefficient manner when new technology is very available and no more costly?

Cities & Counties would require funding from the state to implement & manage a mandated inspection program.

Not a bad idea if the cost of building can be held down.

How about taxing homes outside of city limits by more than 1/4 mile and in excess of \$350,000 value at 2.5 times the normal tax rate. Apply this money to wildfire fighting.

Require that all new public and private buildings be oriented for maximum solar gain in the winter.

These standards should apply to all buildings, particularly state buildings (ie; buildings built on University campuses) that could be used as examples of energy and cost efficiency. It was very disappointing a few years ago when UM decided, despite signing a national agreement supporting environmentally sound changes on university campuses and great public support for energy efficient student housing, to build graduate student housing without such efficiencies.

More importantly - This needs to some how address both within city limits and outside city limits - otherwise we only encourage sprawl which has the worst effect on climate change - driving to and from work!!!

Increasing regulations on building drives up housing costs.

By all means, raise the efficiency standards -- but again -- subsidize solar and wind -- especially in rural areas where 20% (heat) loss of conventional AC power transmission exhibits highest impact/loss.

must be careful here, more codes and rules makes the system more complicated.

Wholeheartedly support - as a move towards statewide building permits with inspections and enforcement would also result in lower costs for things like homeowners insurance and fire protection.

No more fossil fuels!

essential

Enforcement of the International Energy Code (at a minimum) is essential in all new residential and commercial construction. Tax incentives for construction that exceeds the minimum requirements (with third party verification) should be considered.

Again, I am concerned about the low-income families. It is already hard to find affordable housing now.

Donut rule again

Yes, but it is crucial to reduce indoor toxins in such tight homes or we create new problems; asthma is on the rise, for example, due to such pollutants. Overall VOC output of homes, I feel, must be measured. Changing just paint, stain, and carpeting may be enough and, for wood burning appliances (i.e. high efficiency wood stove) outdoor air source for combustion?

Local building and planning offices are too short-staffed to carry this out.

It is reprehensible that inefficient homes are being built in the Montana climate.

Again...sometimes there are simpler solutions...most public buildings are kept at temperatures well above (winter)/well below (summer) what we maintain in our homes.

require carbon neutral buildings by 2016, I believe Britain is requiring this nationally by 2011, so it is definitely possible. . .also look at requirements for making a certain percent of the building materials be recyclable or have a minimum lifespan-say 200 years?

This should be maintained at the local level. More state involvement is not required or needed.

Again, the economic benefits of leading in this area will be huge.

we need to take advantage of new technologies

Absence of building codes outside of incorporated areas and low to no enforcement in these areas is tantamount to a subsidy for sprawl.

I have just finished two remodels within the city of Bozeman, which is chided for its permit system and codes. Yes, there are problems. But some of the codes are safety oriented; some forward looking. I would call for stricter standards on insulation that is state of the art. I own a house that was legal at the time even though its level of construction is substandard, even for the time. We have little foresight. We think with our wallet, not for the future. That is narrow and historically always wrong.

I am leary of a statewide system. I agree with the general sentiment of this concept but it should be done at a local level.

Need to get local entities to collaborate on this. Need muscle from the state to make this happen.

Need to get local entities to collaborate on this. Need muscle from the state to make this happen. There would need to be adequate personnel to operate the program plus incentives if there is to be a higher standard requiring added costs to a project.

This must be smart (anti) growth recommendation, people move to Montana for the country, to do what they want, when they want - not to live in the cities they are leaving behind.

Again a bad idea. Not much effect. Better consider costs.

Again, this is the foundation upon which any energy strategy needs to be based.

Need to avoid using mandates. Should encourage with incentives rather than enforcement with a larger bureaucracy.

What will this cost? Who pays? I do not want to pay additional taxes for this program.  
NO WAY!!!! MARKET INCENTIVES WILL TAKE CARE OF THIS

There is large scope for energy savings here.

Is this not in place now?

Let's set the bar higher and make sure everyone meets it. Investing in efficiency in our homes up front means huge savings later.

This will be costly to those who can least afford it. It further lead to another draconian, authoritarian bureaucracy existing to justify its existence...

This sounds like it would increase the government payload, too. More inspectors. How do we check on inspectors in MT? Are they doing a good job now?

is there a MT alt builders guild, Green Contractors need ways to promote themselves, and set standards

New construction codes should be raised, but again, with consideration given to low income families. Efficiency and conservation are more cost effective and proven than any other "treatments" to buildings. Again, government buildings should act as role models.

Buildings are HUGE energy consumers.

this is more government

One of the best conservation methods is to preserve and reuse old buildings. This eliminates teardown and major landfill and hazardous material issues.

MOre Government, higher costs...absolutely not!

The standards are there in many aspects as of now. They are not adhered too. No new standards are met. There is no uniformity amongst govermental agencie, ie, City, County, State in this aspect.

Again, market and energy cost conditions will take care of this on their own. Why drive the cost of construction higher than it needs to be?

I believe this would creative huge problems for many ranch and farms in Montana

Yes, we need to rein in the builders/contractors and private individuals who build/remodel outside city limits. We also need to rein in people who build cheap, flimsy and not energy efficient buildings!

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

Big brother is reaching out for us. Use education and incentives, not mandates by idealists.

All new homes I have witnessed being built here in the Tobacco Valley over the past three years have excellent energy-conservation techniques utilized in the construction process. It seems people are already doing this, without government oversight.

A better solution would be a code rating system rather than an enforcement system. Enforcement ultimately leads to bad bureaucratic implementation and stagnates innovation. With how badly the industry has done in energy efficiency innovation, we REALLY don't want to stagnate the little companies that are.

If this state is going to have building codes. then let the insurance companies do the inspections. I do not need some gov. employees telling me how to build a house, most gov.employees never had a real job

How much fossil energy a building uses is none of the government's business. This would give the government yet more snooping power into the lives of private citizens.  
An absolute MUST.

This is critical.

This should be an avenue for voluntary compliance, not mandated through building codes or building permits.

Hell no! -1 on this one.

need to inforce outside of city limits i agree

Encourage the techonolgy development to make it more cost effective and builders will use it!! All this will do is make everything more expensive for everyone and has no incentive to do otherwise. All these laws punish rather than reward. Punishment has never been a good means to "encourage" behavior.

Great idea, but lots of the codes in the city are hard to enforce and would require many existing homes to be totally remodeled. A large Tax for new homes not build to code could be enforced and large incentives for people to remodel older homes may work better.

I believe this should apply to all buildings, residential, commercial, and governmental. I would advocate for required inclusion of renewable energy sources, such as solar thermal, on ALL new construction.

I don't mind updating codes, but allowing an entity to enforce its codes outside that entity's boundaries is simply wrong.

I oppose a statewide building program like this draconian system planned. We don't need this. People will save energy by their own incentives. Let price of fuels and materials control the construction of buildings.

I don't support yet another State Agency.

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

The above video destroys the myth of human caused global warming. Get informed. The truth shall make you free.

More Governmental control, need incentives to want to exercise green alternatives

Exceeding national standards penalizes Montana home buyers by increasing the cost of construction.

The standard building codes should required energy efficiency materials meeting todays standards. We do not need anymore government or state/city control. All our resources are spent funding all these special departments. Put the money where it works.

The percentage of construction that is not using Best Building Practices is so low, that it cannot be quantified. to force permitting that further strains the infrastructure of local government is another unfunded mandate that is passed onto the citizens of Montana.

Again as consumer see prices rise for fossil fuels, they will insist upon more efficient building structures. Let the markets alone. Again what would be the added cost to such code changes. Cost in research & development of new codes, Cost in addition building time, and materials, well this make housing more or less available to low to moderate income families. Well the change actually make a difference in the Global warming. Having just complete a building project in the last five years, we do not need more, but less government mandated regulations.

Very strongly against ANY expansion of state building codes. Having ATTEMPTED to deal with this entity, they are a major hinderance to Montana and anyone attempting to do anything. Our county has lost 3 businesses because of the threat from this entity to force compliance and re-engineering of existing facilities and holding up new construction. This entity needs a major overhaul, not more power.

Too Many codes and regulations currently exist the give government control of our lives. This just adds more control and provides no value.

There are too many codes being pushed down our throats already. Fees for these cods only go to line the pockets of the politicians.

We have way too many codes and permits for fees that are bureaucratic, frustrating, and ineffective, yet costly to the people. PLEASE do not add more permits and codes, but rather offer incentives to those who would choose to utilize a higher standard.

If individuals want to pay for more energy use, what business is it of the State?

Come on, talk to our building inspectors, what few overworked there are in the state. Like they'll have enough time to do this plus their current code inspection jobs! We don't need government shoving this down our throats! How about voluntary "compliance?"

This could drive some potential businesses out of business. When more red tape is introduced it makes it harder and more expensive to build. It would also make taxes higher to manage the program.

Building codes should not be on a county by county basis. Again the added cost of increased energy efficiency should be recoverable by the building owner in a reasonable time

This has the potential to significantly increase housing costs. At a time when affordability is the buzzword. Again it will affect most those who can least afford it.

I think it would be better to work with contracting community and provide education and incentives for them to build in energy efficiency into their construction efforts.

Building codes should not be on a county by county basis. Again the added cost of increased energy efficiency should be recoverable by the building owner in a reasonable time.

land holders should be allowed to use the natural minerals found on their land to improve their life condition

This is knee jurk and way over the top.

I think this should target non-residential buildings.

This is not a state function.

Too regulatory and expensive to implement

Strongly oppose. The building industry is already listening to their customers (me) who are requesting energy effecient products (ie R-Control, etc). Government does not need to be adding new regs.

If you are going to do this you have to provide money for enforcement. Self certification or having financial institutes do it is not going to work. You need to hire inspectors and make them enforce the code.

as long as the cost of construction is too much

LEED models are already operating statewide.

Need advanced vision on gray water use and recycling. Need to review septic system promotions.

consider legislation that brings more areas under the jurisdiction of the building energy codes -- modify zoning laws if necessary

My heartily support energy efficiency. However, my concern with this is that buildings not become so "tight" that they are unhealthy. Ventilation systems that allow adequate exchange of indoor and outdoor air are essential in energy tight buildings.

What is the role of local inspection? If the intent is to make this all a state function, I would oppose. This can and should be handled locally. Also, see comments to RC II-1 above; they also apply here.

Montana as a whole should be more responsible for its energy use, and being more efficient is the key.

See above comment. Why don't we just triple the property taxes for anyone with a second home, or that have a vacation property in our state. Or are they the ones funding this survey?

more permits - taxes = higher cost to build

**ABSOLUTELY NOT!**

This recommendation, although relatively thorough, needs to have stricter/seperate standards for commercial and state agency buildings (the state should lead by example in all possible scenarios, such as CC-7). This should include standards recommended by the Western Governor's Association ("Policy Recommendations for Energy Efficient Buildings, January 2008) that encourage LEED certification, Energy Star for homes, and BUILT GREEN. Furthermore, there should be a recommendation that current commercial/state buildings must increase their efficiency standards to meet new building codes by a certain date.

This power should be limited to fossil fuel permitting and should not infringe on liberties to build structures in other manners. As long as owners stay below a fossil fuel/resident or worker limit, the building should be permitted.

This is a free market choice, not a government mandate. Spending to save must return the investment in a timely manner or it's wasted money. If moronic Hollywood actors want to spend a fortune on solar cells on their mansions it's their business. We can't afford it.

Building permits should remain the purview of each county. Requiring permits and inspections only serves to inflate the cost of housing without evident improvements to the occupants; and they would require yet another burdensome bureaucracy.

As long as it isn't burdensome on the construction industry and home owners.

Again sounds good in principle, but has the potential danger of adding extreme burden to the construction industry and homeowner. Be careful!!

My guess is most homebuilders building outside jurisdictions are building energy efficient homes. What would be the cost to taxpayers for this new state obligation??

This is a great idea, we must get control of new development so that it will become a natural part of our everyday lives.

Would this apply to new construction only, or would owners of established buildings have to conform to the new standards? Or, is it just when the building is transferred from owner to owner? Who pays?



Remote rural residents do not have access to building materials that may be required by these codes.

Wall insulation should be R28 and ceiling/roof R40+. Glass must be low 'U' value low E and insulated and weather stripped.

make sure the inspections and enforcement programs are heavily backed with personnel and meaningful fines, otherwise the legislation will be as meaningless as a parent who only threatens their child with no follow through.

Not needed. Codes are in place.

It's up to me if I want to live in a cardboard box with no insulation.

I also suggest that more testing is done to ensure that unintended consequences are kept to a minimum. For example, the new energy codes of late 1970s that increased insulation, but also sealed houses up so much that moisture increased and led to mold and moisture problems.

People should be allowed to build what they want on rural lands.

YES!

Only on new office and residential buildings. Provide incentives to upgrade current older structures for more efficient heating, lighting and other energy usage.

Needs a lot more analysis to understand cost to consumers and overall impact on business development.

Yes, this will both help Montana's energy greenhouse gas emissions and make our cities cleaner.

It is hard to determine the extent of the impact to consumers and needs more analysis.

This is the single biggest long-term energy conservation measure. I regularly see housing built in Montana that is poor quality and energy inefficient. Efficiency standards applied across the board would save owners money over the life of their home. It would also assure not competitive advantage to any segment of builders (everyone has to comply with the efficiency standards).

The word 'enforcement' keeps surfacing during this report. We, as a free society do not need government encroaching on and "enforcing" our daily lives!

If you want to fix problems with urban sprawl (much of the growth is unregulated because it is outside city limits) change the annexation laws to allow cities to automatically annex after areas reach a certain density from city center, not this disaster in waiting.

For residential buildings this should be voluntary, not a result of codes and coercive oversight. The exceptions to the above should be mass development (cookie-cutter subdivisions) and manufactured homes.

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.

incentives and education go a lot farther for individual builders. Builders who are taking the "Cheap" way may need some enforcement.

There are so many hidden areas where fossil fuels are used. We need to reduce not just carbon output from factories, but also its usage in everyday items- including buildings.

Codes are simply oppression.

We already have too many regulations in place.

The cost of this program would be incredible!!!

Less government is better, more federal mandates are bad.

## WHO PAYS

Making a discrete part of energy meet higher codes is to destroy the market influence for better use of energy.

Again, we do not need draconian regulation.

This is a good step that should be enhanced with public and contractor education. Encourage leaders in the building field to help educate other contractors. We have to reach the public and builders who don't fall under enforcing jurisdictions.

Provided it does not hinder the home or business owner in being able to move into the home or business by target date already set with contractor and builder.

Please do not increase government spending. Incentives will work. You will raise construction costs and increase property taxes with this line of thinking. This will cause less people to be able to afford to live here.

What is it going to cost and how will they be enforced. are they going to make sense?

A look at city planning zoning is needed to minimize sprawl which is a great consumer of energy and polluter

Great idea! Here in Madison County there is no building code administration, energy code admin or enforcement for residential projects. This is wrong! MT is way behind the US in code administration. Folks arrive here from other states and expect some quality standards when they go to buy a house. They are minimal.

This should be going on now and it should start with rental housing and trailers and apartments along with new buildings that may be going up.

New homes are more energy efficient than existing homes. It seems that the emphasis should be on improving existing homes. New homes are getting less and less affordable already due to costs of construction materials regulatory demands. This will just increase the cost of new homes. Builders are already voluntarily making their homes more energy efficient. The Montana Building Industry Association is rolling out the own voluntary Green Building standards this spring.

Building codes should encourage conservation practices. The use of ground source heat, solar panels on roofs, etc. would help a lot - plus building construction to conserve energy.

This is Montana -- we don't even enforce decent building standards under conventional criteria. Good luck on this one.

The government's function is to provide infrastructure & basic services. Leave the building improvements to engineers & market driven forces. Together, that combination can be efficient at making improvements.

That is unconstitutional. the people who are outside of town have no input in the procedure and are effectively taxed with out representation.

Include requirement for solar panel systems in new homes exceeding \$100,000.

The cities and counties are currently handling building code inspections and enforcement. No need to set up a new statewide bureaucracy. Why conserve only fossil fuels?

Yes, but I could see the little guy getting squeezed on this. You apply for a permit to remodel your home and the local government says you have to provide all these updates and changes. I could see it for new commercial buildings.

The government already has too much control. This is absolutely absurd

Set time frame for developing building codes - 2008, 2009.

We are only wasting our resources if we allow construction to not take advantage of current energy saving technology. With increased production (mass production) of energy efficient construction the costs associated with that construction will decrease.

It is hard to determine the extent of the impact to consumers and needs more analysis.

Look, if stupid people want to throw their money away building energy-wasting structures, let them be stupid.

No statewide building permits - too restrictive - too much government

Mandating double pane windows and CFB in new construction or remodeling would go a long way towards energy efficiency

The free market system (price of energy/demand) will dictate personal decisions in construction methods without regulations by government.

By doing this, recognize that it impacts the poor the most. Personally, I think there is merit to consider promoting all houses over a certain price range and that are in sunny climates to build in solar panels for individual power needs. Montana could take the lead in building the panels for the nation/world. If we can produce aluminum here, why not solar panels?

There is little residential building occurring outside of city limits in Eastern Montana. This policy if legislated, would create a hardship on small rural counties. Many of us do not have even a part-time sanitarian. It would also add to the cost of state government in FTEs.

This should be expanded to the county level if jurisdiction would be limited by a City designator.

This is an Orwellian Big Brother proposal that would likely cost many, many times any potential energy savings. Energy costs already demand state of the art buildings without government bureaucrats demanding more paperwork and inspections. Has there been any calculation of the amount of energy it would take to implement and enforce such a program? How would the huge bureaucracy implement such a huge program and how would all the inspections be financed? Oh yes, simply add it on to the cost of a house that is already unaffordable for the average Montana worker. How much gasoline would be used each year by the Building inspectors? The Climate Change Advisory Committee is completely out of touch with Montana citizens that State Government is supposed to serve to even propose such a crackpot idea.

The market is working towards this on its own.

This is a win/win situation for all.

Nice idea, but building code inspection costs add thousands and thousands of dollars to building and remodeling projects. The more stringent and costly you make the codes and inspections, the harder it will be to comply, and the more likely that shortcuts will occur.

The problem is with practicable enforcement. The issue should not be the amount of fossil fuel, it should be energy in general. Even an inefficient building run with partial renewable energy has a significant impact due to the need for back up etc.

As an Energy Star builder I feel this is one of the first things that should be implemented in the industry in order to put the builders of the state on the forefront of the Green challenge.

Too much government bureaucracy.

Many schools are saving tax dollars and decreasing fire risks by using logging slash to heat boilers.

Essential

I came to Montana after having lived in many other western states about 25 years ago and it just continually amazes me how lax and unwilling Montana is to get proactive on issues of zoning and code. I heartily agree with this proposal

Makes a lot of sense and would help reduce fire and other costs to the citizens.

Leave this to local or county jurisdiction.

Enforcement would be difficult and the financial burden on marginal/rural families could be a significant hardship. Means testing might be necessary based on square footage.

Adopt 2006IECC w/out any exemptions for basement insulation requirement. Consider requiring Energy Star Certification or at minimum Green Building Certifications particularly for low cost affordable housing or that funded w/public resources. See Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, PL 110-140, Sec. 481 and revised section 109 Energy Efficiency Standards. Energy Star Northwest-Plus certification should be a minimum standard for new construction and major rehab

I would suggest that it would be important to keep a positive message to home owners and builders that this code would benefit them both in energy savings and for enhancing the value of their home upon resale.

Enforcement. It will be difficult to get political acceptance of enforcement. Currently the capacity for local govt to do effective enforcement is minimal.

It might need to begin with BMP within the building industry and banks requiring bmp and efficiently performing buildings as part of loan process.

BUILDING OFFICIALS "NOW" ARE UN-FAMILIAR OR IGNORE MANY BUILDING CODES UNDER IRC 2006---PLAN REVIEW RROCESS IS MAINLY ANOTHER WAY TO COLLECT \$\$\$ FOR INCOMPLETE BUILDING PLAN ASSESMENT---

Again, make everyone comply. The issue of retrofitting is the most contentious because of the increased cost of renovation versus initial construction. Perhaps you start with the largest buildings, provide incentives, and then as technology and expertise improve, move to smaller buildings and older residential. For new residential and commercial, require stricter standards. Increasing the cost of a building is not going to significantly deter a buyer who is amortizing the cost over 30 years.

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

Too many hidden cost increases

This is going to be a tough sell with the power of developers against it. Try lightening up on the mandate, educate and incentivize to move to the same goal.

The superrich will build castles to standards anyway, while the poor/disenfranchised and the alternative/experimental builder/owner will be squeezed out again. What would Henry David Thoreau do?

The legislature has looked at statewide building permits and always determines that building codes are best kept most local. This would be a logistical nightmare to impliment. Lack of population would dictate huge areas for inspectors to cover. Waiting for the inspector to get to small towns and rural areas would seriously hold up construction times and increase the cost of housing.

How about credits for increased use of solar. It feels like fossil fuels have been subsidized for so long that if an even playing field was presented the alternative fuels would finally be given a chance to thrive.

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

there aren't enough inspectors as is (for example, one plumbing inspector for 9 counties near L&C.) Enforce the codes on commercial buildings first, they are the huge wasters, whether new or old. What about the 100+ year old homes in MT, and all the trailer homes. Those are the wasters, not new construction. market forces force most new homes to be more green, it is a selling boost.  
there aren't enough inspectors as is (for example, one plumbing inspector for 9 counties near L&C.) Enforce the codes on commercial buildings first, they are the huge wasters, whether new or old. What about the 100+ year old homes in MT, and all the trailer homes. Those are the wasters, not new construction. market forces force most new homes to be more green, it is a selling boost.

The built environment has a significant CO2 footprint, and updated building / energy codes are recognized means to mitigate its environmental impact. The use of recycled and local building materials is a key element of any policy to enhance the State's building / energy codes. Furthermore, the State should use Life Cycle Assessment methodologies to determine the most appropriate / sustainable building materials and adopt performance standards (in lieu of prescriptive standards) for materials used in building and other infrastructure.

Market forces should accomplish the same result.

There needs to be an incentive program of some kind for existing structures to be retrofitted to increase energy efficiency, but this seems to be addressed elsewhere.

Statewide building permit's are needed for many other reasons and should be a high priority.

clean coal

How do we grandfather in the older buildings?

Support this for new residential and commercial construction only.

How much up-front costs can the consumer afford? Will it price a large segment of homebuyers out of the market? The homes for the wealthy in Big Sky are built without concern for energy savings and used only a few weeks a year. What about the rest of us?

Need more inspectors now. Another case where the initiative involves expanding governmental control, involvement.

It's important for the state to provide guidance on these issues. Occasionally, cities are restricted by statute as to the type of codes they can implement. Addressing out-of-city-limits construction is also crucial.

Need more information. What would increased efficiency cost upfront? How far back in the supply chain do you go?

This affects persons on fixed income and small businesses most. Better codes will help our construction lead the way in reducing lifetime cost of residential and commercial structures.