

RCII-8 Comments
Recommendation 8
Support for renewable energy applications

Find ways to make zero-to-low interest loans available.

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.

Again, would this be an incentive or a mandate? Renewable energy is a great idea, as long as we are honest as to its true cost.

Depends on the cost.

I support with the caveat that variable intermittent renewable resources must be balanced by the utility with dispatchable resources which are likely to be gas-fired combustion turbines.

Absolutely positively unequivocally YES!

This is in no way efficient!! Note the current rise in corn prices due to our making fuel from corn. Now it costs me more for groceries while fuel costs remain the same. The energy input to produce fuel from corn [or other "renewable resources"] exceeds the energy derived from that source! How foolish! This is not good stewardship of the resources given to us.

WIND POWER!

Passive solar design offers a lot of reward for a harsh climate like we have, see www.builditsolar.com

No special treatment for otherwise uncompetitive projects.

Free market will lead to sensible solutions.

For those of us who have hydropower, our carbon profile is lower. The problem with hydropower is that it has the most vulnerability to the consequences of climate change. Renewable energy is a great additional resource and could complement our existing energy portfolio.

Renewable energy applications where? Who is going to pay for it. Most consumers can't afford the current costs of the systems and they have their hands out. If the technology can't pay for itself in a reasonable time frame who is it benefiting if utilities have to subsidize it.

Especially rooftop solar systems. I do not particularly support large-scale industrial-style corporate wind farms and their accompanying transmission lines! Small, distributed alternative energy systems, especially rooftop solar, are better!

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

only where cost effective

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. Not sure what this is either but definitely support the expansion of renewable energy.

Coal is the fuel of the Industrial Revolution. We can't afford any more "dark, Satanic mills."

Renewable is the only way to go: if not now then we face economic disaster.

Always a good idea if government does not get more power.

YES YES YES YES YES and YES! I cannot emphasize the importance of demand side reductions in GHG. Montana has a hardy, conservative, rural population representing a perfect audience for consumer-sited, zero/low GHG power and heat generation.

and nuclear power, which is the cleanest, safest, and cheapest form of power known to man today.

must be proven to be energy neutral or better

I'm skeptical regarding the use of ag commodities to alcohol. We must assure that the energy output sufficiently exceeds the total input.

Not enough detail to support. Too broad

Too loosely worded. See above comment

Only where it is truly economical(without Government incentives).

But not biofuels made of corn or other food crops, especially those that require pesticides and fertilizers.

I favor tax incentives for things like solar panels on roofs, and solar water heating, etc.

During the 1970's, the Montana Legislature positioned the state to become a national/international leader in ramping up a transition away from fossil fuels by passing the coal tax trust and funding renewable energy research and demonstration. Ted Scwhwinden put too many engineers in charge of these programs. They became conservative bureaucrats. Lets not make this mistake again.

As long as it is not fake. Nukes are fake. What we proved in Montana in 89 is still totally valid today.

Urge Rural Electri Cooperatives to accept power generated by individuals using solar and or wind., i.e., let the meters run backwards as regular utilities now do.

Done on a small scale these do not tend to be very cost effective. Larger wind farms make more sense. We need to encourage things like wind development, but we need guidelines in place to make sure that wind farms are set up in ecologically justified areas (i.e. not in a place that is a migratory bird flyway, not in a place that requires massive new road construction).

again, what's this

if they're effecient

SEE FIRST COMMENT ON RENEWABLE ENERGY. NOT FEASIBLE WITHOUT TECHNO BREAKTHROUGH.

Especially solar, wind; not necessarily hydro, biofuels.

Energy independence is possible and it means having renewable energy systems EVERYWHERE!

I need education about what this means.

The full scope of the impact of each renewable energy form needs to be assessed and development of these systems needs to consider the impacts for each location. There also needs to be an awareness that new technology is not always readily accepted by the public, but opinions do and will change with proven results. Refer to "Change in Public Attitudes towards a Cornish Wind Farm: Implications of Planning" by Eltham, Harrison, and Allen.

Especially solar and wind--not necessarily hydro and biofuels.

Ensure residential is included in this.

Yes the state should fund technology for Renewable energy technology through goals versus mandates.

Fine as long as it does not increase taxes or cause artificial increase in energy or construction costs.

how will this be fleshed out?

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

Only if practical, using current use technology and not cost prohibitive to consumers.

Streamline, and put in state control if possible. At community level, too many players that bog the process.

Converting food to fuel is absolute insanity. Particularly when so much of the world is starving and our own food bills are climbing at dramatic rates.

Harvesting under-brush/bio-mass from our natural resources, dumps, etc, is a far more sensible direction.

Needs clarification.

Tax breaks for Renewable Energy Applications, not additional fees on current energy applications.

only if economically viable - I DO NOT want my tax dollars subsidizing a technology that can't make it on its own in the marketplace.

Let the free market manage this.

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.

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

too generic ?

Let the Free Markets do it. They can do it better.

Support for renewable resource development must have the support of the state of Montana. Using care in supporting businesses and property owners to pursue this energy will benefit everyone.

For the second time you have ask me to vote on a topic that is not clearly defined either by seeing ES-4. the first thing I notice is that you reference 1990 data, and I know that will some what pad your conclusion, because I know the deference between 1990 cars and appliance and the 2008 because I own them. the newer are much more efficient with out any additional regulations, let the consumer decide. and the supplier met the demands of the consumer

Good idea if not legislation or red tape is added to affect the business or individual. Offer incentives.

expand hydro power

Hydro electric is the best and least expensive renewable energy we have. Perhaps should be building dams instead of tearing them down. Other forms of renewable are OK but must remember the consumer pays more in the end.

Renewable energy alternatives are already being pursued in areas where they are viable.

Hydro electric is the best and least expensive renewable energy we have. Perhaps should be building dams instead of tearing them down. Other forms of renewable are OK but must remember the consumer pays more in the end.

if they are self supporting ok, if not then they are out.

I like the idea of incentives for those who want to implement renewable energy applications.

What is this?

Will be much more expensive energy

Would support if it is restricted to our government offices/buildings.

Okay for a limited amount but will be expensive for customers having to flip the bill for this. Nore that the wind doesn't blow all the time and needs to be backed up by expensive natural gas fired turbines. Someone is going to have to bear the cost for this equipment, and it will end up being the customers.

raise taxes to make more expensive energy than the conventional oil and gas. oil, coal, and gas are renewable energy also.

This proposal has many benefits, and I highly encourage the state to see this through. By providing incentives, as well as creating regulatory measures that would ease the process of introducing renewable energy projects into communities, institutions, and industries in Montana, the state would be empowering its citizens to take control of their energy generation capacities. If power generation can become more local and decentralized, it can become more clean and efficient, and in the end communities, industries, etc. will save money.

Of course.

This depends on the source. Burning biomass from logging operations makes sense. We should use it for heat rather than burning as slash. Corn based ethenol makes little sense, in the long run it causes more green housegas then oil and its use would casue higher food cost.

Strong need to favor community-scale and community-based energy enterprises. Decentralized, small-scale power will keep more energy dollars in our communities, where those dollars will circulate many times over. Disruptions in energy supply in a decentralized system will affect fewer energy users than in centralized systems.

Renewable costs more and pollutes more when the books aren't cooked and true costs and effects aren't hidden.

Not enough information to support.

Renewable energy that is environmentally responsible and cost effective is good. Converting food cropland to energy crops is mostly counterproductive.

This is a no brainer.

Not at the expense of common sense.

We have already generated 63,416 kw since October 2004. We have 5 solar panels on our roof that on sunny days in the last week or two have put our 500 gal. hot water tank temps in the 80-90 degree range and again have off set any other type of fossil fuels.

If we could afford a hydrogen generator for home heating we would be probably independent on any fossil fuels. We still have a couple fossil fuel cars but also now have a electric vehicle that we built ourselves that gets us back and forth from town at highway speeds on one charge.

Based on what criterion

Look before we leap. No more biofuel debacles. Consider the Law of Unintended Consequences.

I have no problem in using proven and economically sound renewable energy.

Supporting 'renewable energy' is fine. However, in government terms this merely says ... GOVERNMENT CONTROL! No thank you.

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.

Vague

More effort to utilize forest biomass for it's own value as well as to prepare for possible loss of pulp mill

More funding needs to be made available for start-up costs in plant, possibly on a loan basis. A 5 MW plant producing electricity could repay a \$5 million loan in less than 5 years. Wind machines are not cost effective nor is use of corn for ethanol.

Oh now your talking....renewable. Can hardly wait. What it means is that poor people pay a lot more of their income so rich people can feel morally superior. Did you go to Yale?

Define renewable energy applications.

Recycling pollutes more than making the original product, talk fact, not fiction.

Are these inherently cost efficient?

Push wind in suitable sites. incentives for solar. Also research small scale hydro-electric in western montana.

I agree that we need to look at all of the alternatives out there for energy. I am concerned that we will have to try to heat our houses with windmills. We should instead be drilling for oil, burning wood, AND working on wind and solar applications. I can see what bio fuel is costing already in the price of feed for my livestock.

Very important to us in MT. Many other states, like CA, have much better tax incentives for homeowners to empty wind or solar power systems.

I am not in favor of using food grains for ethanol nor biodeisel. Algae is much more promising for biodiesel and switch grass, hemp, and other non food plants that can be grown in marginal land is preferable for ethanol

Well -- it's a nice "feel-good" title, but what exactly does it mean?

Absolutely essential

Like what? Wind turbines?

more taxpayer money going for what? renewable energy should be a personal choice not used to feed big energy companies tax payers money for good looking ineffective measures. Stop wasting my money on the whims of new york and california politics!

Use some common sense.

Set time frame.

No Position

No. When it becomes economic, it will happen.

I'm conservative on this one...in theory this sounds good, but with biofuels there are obvious draw backs including inefficient production, more importantly it takes food out of the mouths of the needy around the world, plus it drives up the costs of food locally which in effect puts a tax on those who can afford it least. (Just an FYI, I'm a grower of grain products as a major part of my income.) Placement of wind power towers needs to be studied more to determine the impact on migrating birds. Next generation solar power to meet individual needs ought to be promoted and carried out more aggressively.

Renewable Energy development has advanced since the 1980s and it's about time. Wind, solar, and the development of bio-diesel and ethanol must be encouraged while developing our fossil fuels. We need it all!

Apply all existing laws uniformly. Applications to develop "renewable energy" should not be treated any differently than any other development.

Yes! We need to do this, and MAKE the COOP's Support RE Applications also

We have to get off the fossil fuel bandwagon.

Let the free market without determine/

We think that Montana is missing the boat in not looking at the "critical mass" of helping individuals achieve energy independence through using individual applications of renewable energy. In England there is such a movement. Here, we offer money incentives for companies and for big projects but nothing is available for the small projects, which if there were enough of them would add up....

sustainable is not always renewable though.

Support needs to come from many quarters.

tax incentives for solar and ground source heat pumps allow full credit for surplus energy generated and put back on the grid

This should be allowed especially to enhance Montana's need for more widely distributed energy to account for changing weather patterns (a la, hydro), and for localizing energy production to keep money circulating in local economies.

must relate to scientifically proven means of reducing CO2 emissions.

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

Again, this is a good objective, but lots of implementation challenges. Put together some knowledgeable people to work on this before rolling out legislation.

and this?

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

again, provide tax credits, stop wasting money on more legislation and government-subsidized education

not by subsidising renewables while penalizing coal. coal will have to be part of the solution

What kind and how much support?

Lets just cover the country side with wind mills. When the wind stops blowing for a minute, no problem heck we don't power all the time. By the way, lets do away with cars and require bikes or only electrical cars.

Combined heat and Power projects make sense from an efficiency standpoint and they use renewable carbon neutral sources of heat if fired with biomass. 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 actions.

Increase tax credits for individuals, provide a meaningful tax credit for businesses installing re systems. Consider a credit that can be "sold" similar to Oregon's Business Energy Tax Credit. Schools and others with no tax liability can "sell" the tax credit to a party with appetite for the credits, resulting in an injection of capital into re projects.

