

TLU-1 Comments
Recommendation 26
Light duty vehicle clean car standards

We are not CA. The costs to MT people with our very low income as compared to CA will be very harmful. The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

Government meddling/incentives rarely result in progress. Montana should be working to remove barriers to progress not impeding them by adding bureaucracy that adds no value to the end product. Furthermore, this report was based on a politically correct directive which assumes there is a man-made climate crisis. While this assumption has the backing of the media and politicians it has little support from the scientific community. Hence the reporting by the media of the relative minority that support the theory. Technology should be able to stand on its own merits without government incentives.

And, people who drive heavy duty trucks (with the exemption of ranchers and contractors) should be taxed according to their projected rate of emission.

California is NOT a great example of how to run a state. This too will add cost to consumers with no clear benefit. Spend the money on putting out forest fires and it would be way more cost effective and get rid of more CO2.

This is doable. We should also tax higher emitting vehicles more.

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.

theres to much epa control now, cars used to run better without all this emission con.

How will people be able to retrofit their cars so they will meet the newer air standards?
Become more like CA????? Arrrrrgggggghhhh!! Did you not notice the power problems they have been having? Have you not noticed the cost of living down there?

NEVER follow Cal.

In this case, agree strongly with sample legislation

This should have been done a long time ago. We say we want a clean and healthful environment, but we don't put our money where our mouth is!

Excellent - take a lead - it is the right action.

Let the feds lead.

Is this to support all the vehicles in the state or is specifically for the cities with the greatest population?
Do the residents of McCone County have the same inspection requirements those in Gallatin county?

I support adopting current standards, but not necessarily blindly following wherever CA leads.
I prefer the market drive changes. Stop the subsidies of bad behavior and that, combined with the end of fossil fuels, will lead to different behavior.

Again how much does Montana effect the national average? It's okay to participate and be one of the 14 states but how much are we going to affect the % of emissions? We need to start some place but let's be REAL.

We should be at the same standards as Japan. Aren't we the LEADERS of the free world?
When?????

The cars in Montana are not the problem.

Absolutely, go beyond federal emissions standards!

It is shameful that Congress's recent increase in CAFE standards is the first one in over 30 years. Clearly, the states need to take the lead on this one.

Which legislators are dying to commit political suicide?

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

Why not be the leader instead of following CA?

Oh yea, let's follow California. Did it ever dawn on anyone that we don't have a Los Angeles, San Francisco, or San Diego in Montana?

Rather than adopt California emissions, implement testing to ensure vehicles meet federal emissions requirements as they currently stand.

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. Oh HELL NO! People are LEAVING California in droves to come up here. Why? WE ARE NOT CALIFORNIA!(thank God)

Or we could even go beyond California!

Yay, CA!

Yes!!!

maybe you should move to California

Causes creation of unsafe, small vehicles that cost more than they are worth. Let the market determine these demands, not the government!

Yes!!!

GREAT IDEA.

This will never work. Montana needs standards that meet Montana needs. What works in California may not work in Montana, and the expense of the vehicles is not commensurate with the income levels of Montanans, as compared to Californians. Better to come up with a way to incentivize Montanans to buy/use hybrids/electric cars.

Washington DC has proven to drag our nation's feet, even with implementing technology already within our capabilities. It's a joke and an opportunity for Montana to lead the nation. What a message for a rural state to take the lead on global warming, national security, and long-term economics!

I do NOT support adopting California's standards.

There is no need to implement further emissions standards, in the name of "global warming" or any other cause.

Yes! Montana can become a leader in this--with so much natural beauty and so many resources, we need to think ahead and protect what we can.

For Sure! States rights! Can't depend upon the feds to do this: remember "privatization?" and Butte

California has enough nuts for the whole country. We do not need to follow their idiot examples.

All vehicles should be included, and although diesel emissions are less, they should be considered for the toxicity level, particularly in vehicles such as school buses that expose children to dangerous levels of those contaminants.

Finally, a CA piggy-back solution. MT cannot possibly lead (too small) but can at least follow the leader.

this is legislation. we should never legislate personal choices. what if i want to buy 30-year-old car? we should NEVER follow anything california does.

As Montana has no auto makers who would build the cars and trucks for use in Montana?

Yes, EPA standards are too lax.

Concern: How will financially limited individuals be able to cope with new efficiency standards?

Have you lost your minds? Have you not seen the impact of this in California both in terms of consumer cost and market disruption. Do you not realize that in Montana because of the climate and topography these vehicles, which are a luxury in California, are a necessity here for a high percentage of our population and businesses.

Screw California and all the Californians who are moving here to get away from crap like this

Why not work trucks, too? So many used that industry will listen if forced to.

absolutely, Montana citizens can be leaders

tell the EPA where to go

This is yet another costly endeavor to the Montana citizen. Wages are already below average and yet we want to tax the poorest of us all.

Why should we follow California-the state is bankrupt and has driven the cost of housing out of reach for many people.

We are so behind on this that this is like a minimum. We have not been moving forward on this for the last 20 years. It is time.

Follow California??

Next session please!

If you like California standards - move to California. One size fits all DOES NOT.

This could be a significant cost to small businesses that rely on transportation and will see higher costs due to the higher standard.

How do I get my boat to the lake or horse to the fairground?

Everything we do is going to cost the consumer more money. Will the state be able to meet this burden or will it continue to fall on the Montana resident who can't get by as it is. Not smart to strap this kind of burden on

Yes, yes, yes.

California doesn't know what it's doing. Why should we follow the lead of morons.

Will raise the price of cars above other states.

Absolutely not. We are a whole different state than California, with different needs. This would hurt Montana citizens and their ability to make a living, in some cases.

NEVER!!!! ANY LEGISLATOR THAT SUPPORTS THIS SHOULD JUST PACK HIS BERKENSTOCKS AND HEAD TO CALIFORNIA HIM/HERSELF

Federal government lagging far behind in this area.

Critical piece of puzzle is to increase fuel efficiency standards above current levels!

Montanans drive more per capita than almost anyone, so significant emission reduction should be achievable. Tough to do in such a large and sparsely populated state. Better options available.

Yes!

The market will exist if California shifts its standards--let's not get left behind with old, inefficient cars and trucks while the rest of the country moves onto better cars.

We do not need to follow California - in Montana

the cost of individually replacing low efficiency vehicles within the entire transit sector might be too much for the public to bear at this time. but I do think people should not be driving -15mpg vehicles in urban applications. We should have to justify our use of SUVs and trucks

Colorado has had emission testing in effect for decades. It is time we follow suit.

What about public transportation?

NO No No

Set a new standard!

why is it, we need another states standards you can do only what the things that for Californis what makes you think we need them?

What are the costs to citizens of MT by this requirement?

Why? Do we need to absorb this cost too? It's tough enough to make a living in this state without letting California dictate how we live and what we will pay. Take a look at Missoula and its air quality now versus 20-years ago. Vast improvements have been made. We don't need this legislation.

I SO VERY MUCH SUPPORT THIS. WE NEED TO DO THIS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE! This is brilliant!!

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

Montana is "not" California. Our air problems are not even nearly alike.

Ignore or fight federal judicial decisions that limit this state right.

This will not help Montana's air quality and will result in increased costs to the poor who, more often than not, cannot afford a newer car that would meet these requirements.

go back to 1970 when most families own one vehicle

You have got to be kidding! California legislation in Montana? How many people on the board which came up with these recommendations is originally from Montana?

Contingent effectiveness tied to other state's adoption. We cannot go it alone.

Have you ever rented that DVD "Who killed the electric car?"

it will put a bit of folks in the hole, not knowing how to get a new or improved car, this will effect low income, but i think it is nessisary over time.

if we got rid of our price tag on the war, then we could spent some of that money finding vehicles for these folks i am in support of this topic, but it has multiple sides

There is absolutely no way I can support any measure that will have Montana following California standards. Look at the rampant inflation in California, their out of control taxation rates. This is a slippery slope that will make Montana's cost of living beyond the reach of most Montanans.

California's extra-stringent emissions laws are a mockery. More energy and pollution is wasted/caused by implementing the program than the benefits it purports to provide. Keeping existing vehicles on the road, even at their "higher" emission levels, has less overall pollution than the cost of producing new, low emission vehicles. I would prefer to see car manufacturers encouraged to simply stop selling cars in California, rather than meet California's unreasonable demands.

California rules stink!

Great!

California is in really big trouble. The last thing you want to do is to copy California's "Plan for Disaster."

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 don't want to let California decide what Montana's policy will be. After they adopt standards and they are proven effective then we should look at this option

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

Ridiculous

Montana is a sovern state. We cannot afford to allow our citizens to be impacted by judgements made by California or any other state. One size does not fit all.

Yes, California Laws are for me, that what I want, to be a state in bankruptcy.

Yes, and add hundreds if not thousand of dollars to the cost of and Automobile. In a state where a car or truck are not a luxury, but a necessary item. Please check the cost of a new car in California compared to Montana. Also keep in mind that if we don't follow California exactly year by year, we will not be able to buy cars make to our specification, except at a much higher cost, because what car manufacture is going to build to our specifications.

We are NOT CALIFORNIA.

NEVER!! I will move. California has already ruined most of this state. Less than a million people in a state the size of Montana is a very different issue than the mess in California. Clifornia is the last state we should be emulating as any form of example. I cannot believe that someone in Montana's representative government would begin to utter much less support this proposal.

I lived in CA and this was a joke. Do not adopt.

California is a huge mess, are you even thinking of emulating that mess. Please...

Many Montanans are former Californians. We moved out of California becuase it's been ruined with liberal, environmental not so friendly regulations, politicians and laws criminalizing everything people do.

Maybe when CA adopts standards on emissions from forest fires, MT should follow.

I am disgusted that Montana politicians can't think for themselves and think they need to follow all the time. Montana is NOT Ca!

YES. YES. Please do this - if the Federal government won't lead, we must!

We are not even sure that we are causing the problem. I personally think that this is just another scare tactic to make some people rich.

ABSOLUTELY NOT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!11

I agree that the standards should be adopted, but should not be greater than Federal Standards. Many of the standards adopted in California have forced companies to move to surrounding states. While California may in fact set the standards because of their economy I would not agree with Montana cart blank approving their standards.

NO NO NO NO LOOK AT THE MESS CA. IS

We already are unable to take advantage of European high efficiency diesel autos because of California standards. The ultimate end result of less fuel burned far outweighs the tailpipe emissions.

Go way beyond CA...

I agree that the standards should be adopted, but should not be greater than Federal Standards. Many of the standards adopted in California have forced companies to move to surrounding states. While California may in fact set the standards because of their economy I would not agree with Montana cart blank approving their standards.

We need to stick to federal legislation.

Not very realistic, given Montana incomes, compared to the California wage scale. California has more flexibility for initiatives that will cost consumers.

Why go beyond federal emission standards? Those standards were based on studies to protect the environment. What information do we have that tells us this change in Montana will make any difference? Let's rely on EPA to develop federal emission standards, especially for a global issue like climate change.

At what cost to the consumer and the state?

With the size of our state and the distances between communities I don't see the need

The tail cannot wag the dog

Horrible idea, why don't we just all walk to where we are going.

too expensive

This will cripple our ag industry. Just another set of regs to drive up the cost of living in MT.

California!!! Weren't they the ones who gave us Electric Deregulation? Someone must be hanging out in Hollywood too much (hint: Governor BS)

NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.
NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.
NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,
NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,NO.NO.NO,

We are more progressive than California, I hope: we have more to protect.

Take California's lead and adopt even tougher standards.

Why does California have to take the lead? Where's the 'backbone' in our state government to take the initiative?

With 900,000 citizens this is not a problem in Montana. We should not have to bear the additional cost of this standard when we do not need it. Our low occurrence of ozone and NOx prob's compared to urban states is a testament to this.

And get rid of the loophole for SUVs and light trucks.

You cannot compare Montana and California. The burdens may be too great for this region. Again, have you really done a cost/benefit analysis?

Yes! We could improve greatly in gas efficiency for our vehicles. Vehicles who do not adhere to standards should be taxed more.

Strongly disagree. Don't need more California influence in the state.

The new standards are still substandard by today's technology.

I don't live in California. I don't want Montana to become California. There are more people living as hermits in the Mojave desert than in Montana.

raises cost

Yes but this does nothing for older vehicles or the some 50% who live below poverty. Need retrofit technologies to deal with older vehicles and keep them also out of landfill

I am in favor of this for new cars being sold, but not at all in favor of annual inspections of older cars as this would put an undue hardship on mid to low income people.

California, Californians, and those here who think like them are the problem in Montana. Remember, the fewer people here, the less GHG emissions, period. The next thing Montana will want to do is adopt the Pelosi standards of politics.

California standards? Are you kidding me? Absolutely not.

As much as you don't want to admit it Montana IS NOT California. Stop trying to pass California laws on Montana. Those of us that have lived here all of our lives are NOT for it.

I think diesel trucks should be limited to farmers, contractors, and others that need such for business purposes only, not just for looks of to "keep up with the Jones's". Diesel vehicles pollute in two ways...their exhaust and their noise. Also, diesel exhaust triggers my asthma, as do some other exhaust fumes. I will do most anything to keep from being behind a diesel vehicle's exhaust!!

Of course.

Should consider state tax incentive for purchase of hybrid vehicles.

There is no valid scientific reason to adopt these types of vehicle emissions standards. The only result will be higher per vehicle cost and less choice for the consumer when purchasing a vehicle. For no benefit.

Absolutely

Hell no. We don't have the population density of California and don't have a problem. This will make cars less affordable to real people who need them.

Federal standards for emissions are more than adequate for Montana. The primary effect of adopting CA vehicle emission standards would be to increase the cost of new vehicle purchases. I have yet to observe anything the California does that has been good for Montana.

California emissions standards are oppressive and testing of those emissions is an undue burden on vehicle owners in that state. It would be disgusting to see those standards implemented here and would serve as incentive to leave the state for a less oppressive destination. Furthermore emission standards as implemented by California would only serve to complicate the registration process for vehicles and prove as an insurmountable burden for the poor who would be forced to pay for emissions monitoring prior to registration just as it has in California. This is a horrible idea.

No, taxes would increase.

Follow Feds. We don't need a patchwork of programs. Car prices are high enough already.

Only if this applies to new vehicle purchases and what about the increased purchase costs and maintenance costs

This is a very important recommendation that should not be compromised.

Montana has very clean air now. The real problem is not here, but in other part of the country. This should and is a federal government problem.

This entire document appears to be "Lets do it just like California!"

California should stop allowing all their cars idling in traffic, drive throughs, and in long lines for events. That would save more on emissions than sticking it to us Montanans through the automakers. Check out those Californians oops sorry, I meant Missanfransicans and Bozangelans.

Yes, there are some terribly polluting vehivles on the road, they need to be looked at for sure. That will put a burden on those whose income is very tight but we need to move toward cleaner vehicles. Consumer responsibility.

Would place a burden on this whole state. Montana is sparsley populated and has a lower average income. Taxpayers would not think highly of the purchase of hybrids whose cost benefit wouldn't kick in until the vehicle has 100,000 miles, at which time the state would trade it in.

Please, please, please: don't do ANYTHING that California does!!

Yes, by all means.

Another California standard. This is Montana!

This is allowing the eco freaks in CA to dictate what goes on in MT. Tremendous end result cost to the consumer.

I believe California requires cars to be checked out every so often for their carbon output, that would be very beneficial to have in the standards.

This would not be good for the state of Montana, and is not good for California either. This will result in vehicles that cost significantly more to purchase and are not what anyone wants to drive. We already have federal standards, states should work with the Federal government to develop new standards if they don't like the ones we have. That way we are all working together and not try to force manufactures to make a car for various state standards. This would not allow for economies of scale for manufactureres to keep costs lower. Currently the California standard can not be met by manufactureres. The California standard would limit the availability of diesels and pickups to Montana. We use them for work, do you want to make it even harder for Montana to compete economically?! Do we really want to give California control over Montana?!

This is absurd! Californians need to stay in California. Montana is NOT California! We have different needs in transportation. The manufacturers will be controlled by the market, not California politics. For people needing trucks and larger family vehicles this is unacceptable.

Montana does not need to be adopting any California standards. If the people on the committee that came up with this like California standards, they are free to move there.

This will cost the state and its residents millions of dollars in both direct and indirect costs. Its a complete waste of money!!!

California standards are for California. Montana is not California and one cannot make any type of comparison. Our needs, way of life, income, travel, opportunities, entertainment....everything....are different and will remain so. This proposal did not come from any real Montanans and should not be considered.

What does go beyond entail

Please do this!! It is such an easy way to make a difference!

We probably all drive bigger cars than we need, probably to protect ourselves from possibility of being hit by big cars. Emission standards should be for unburned carbon and other exhaust pollutants.

Adopt California???? I am trying to get out of that place with a semblance of wealth intact. Good luck with Montana's tax base.

IF YOU DON'T LIKE MONTANA MOVE TO CALIFORNIA.

Californians are idiots. NO!

This would effectively take away Montana's ability to set its own standards and be controlled by the extreme left wing liberals (California). Additionally, we are a state heavily into farming and agriculture. We rely heavily on trucks to make our living and this would cut truck allocation for the state by as much as 60%. How are the farmers, ranchers and loggers supposed to use a Toyota Prius to pull their trailers and get back into the country that they draw their living from? Why would we want to cripple our economy with regulations that only work in another state where for most people a car would do everything they need it to do?

MT and CA are not a fair comparison!

THIS IS MONTANA NOT CALIFORNIA, AS A LIFELONG MONTANAN I NEED MY TRUCK TO MAKE A LIVING BY ADOPTING CALIFORNIA STANDARDS YOU WOULD BE LIMITING MY TOOLS TO MAKE A LIVING. THIS IS MONTANA NOT CALIFORNIA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

this would kill mt auto dealers. if cut 60 percent of light trucks and suv in mt. you would see over 70 percent of them go broke. look at the tax money the statet of mt would loose from dealers going broke. the people willgo to state next usto buy thier trucks not vary smart govener.

There are many differencies between CA and MT and why should one's standards be superimposed on the other?

legislation of this nature would be the first step in improving and preserving the environment for generations to come.

Adopting the California CAFE standards will result in great economic hardship to Montana Automobile Dealers. Montana Automobile Dealers have a significant impact on the economy in Montana. In many of Montana's smaller communities auto dealerships are the largest private employer. In 2005, auto dealerships accounted for 18.2% of all retail revenue in the State of Montana. Montana Auto Dealers had sales of \$2.3 billion. The average salary of a new-vehicle dealership employee was \$36,909.00, with dealerships having an average annual payroll of \$1.07million. These wages bring in significant tax revenues for the State of Montana. Unlike California consumers who purchase 51% cars, Montana consumers purchase at least 66% light trucks and SUVs. Some dealers claim the Montana mix is 70% light trucks and SUV's purchased by consumers. Adoption of the California CAFE standard will adversely affect the vehicle choice of Montana consumers. Adoption of the California standards is bad for consumers. Manuf

Cars should be at 50 mpg No excuse.

Right on...California has time and time again to set the pace concerning standards on fuel efficiency and tail pipe emissions that invariably are adopted later by other states...The republicans and "Feds" are the lap dogs of the Corporate oil industry.

if you like the California standards so much find a map of Montana find where I-15 is, go to that highway turn south, and keep going til I-15 ends and enjoy.

Implimentation of this standard would be detrimental to the auto industry in Montana. Manufacturers will not be able to supply enough vehicles to this state to meet demands. Once again sending business out of state.

Do not follow California's lead. Where would we be if we had.

NO WAY. Nothing in CA works correctly from a government standard. We need to buy the vehicles that work. If they are efficient, that is just icing on the cake.

You will kill the local economy if this goes into action. We are not California, and thank God for that!!

Note Feds say CA cannot exceed Fed standards. This needs to be contested.

This would cause considerable financial hardship for many Montanans because of not being able to afford meeting the tougher standards

Since when did we start following California's example in ANYTHING? I get the feeling that that this somehow wormed its way into consideration from one of the flocking droves of refugees now fleeing "The Golden State" and finding themselves in our own little piece of heaven with no real clue as to what else they should do, they try to pull it down piece by piece in order to mimick the hell they just came from. You people are insane if you believe that placing such restrictions on light duty vehicles will be "healthy." Montana depends on a larger portion of light duty trucks than states like California, and yet you want to make it HARDER and MORE expensive for people to purchase and operate them? If he thinks so highly of California's ability to manage and legislate its own business maybe our governor should run for office in the Golden State and leave Montana alone.

I believe federal standards are stringent enough. we don't have the same issues as California and I have been told by the manufacture that because Montana has a higher sales rate of SUV's and light trucks that are allocation would be reduced by 60 percent. also the new CAE standard in place is adequate, there is no need for a special Montana standard

i think that this is a really bad idea for i work at a chevy dealership and 85% of our sales are in the truck and SUV market. if this is passed then i could lose my job because we will lose so much business. so please really think this over thank you

This is the dumbest thing I have ever heard of. Any mechanic knows cars at sea level(California) can not run properly at high elevations (Montana). Its an oxygen level problem. California emissions cars would run rich using more fuel and making more emissions. This is Montana not California, not New York. If its not broke dont fix it.

Of course, this is a must but should be coupled with higher gas mileage requirements for vehicles like in CA.

Leave California out of our standards...Montana has its own standards and we don't need to adopt anyone's else's!

We can do better than California.

This may cause an unwelcome burden on the poor because they are most likely to have old vehicles that have poor emission standards. We need a plan to adapt their vehicles to limit emissions.

I'd rather see this apply to new cars, many Montana citizens wouldn't be able to afford to upgrade if all vehicles are suddenly told to meet standards.

The sooner the better

Absolutely crucial and imperative. As a nation we are not trying to reduce CO2 emissions from vehicles virtually AT ALL !!! Touting a utility vehicle as a "hybrid" that gets 20mpg on the highway is CRIMINAL, because it leads people to believe that we are working for positive change, when what manufacturers are doing is PRETENDING that they are becoming aware of the problem and doing something about it, AND THEY ARE NOT. People buy these vehicles, these SO-CALLED "hybrids," and they think they are doing something to help with the problem.

I wish there was a category to be more strongly against this. The latest wave in the implementation of the California emissions standards is going to put hundreds or thousands of small California based Businesses (contractors, small trucking companies, light industrial firms) out of business. And, the real kicker is it will, in the end, increase the total volume of petroleum burned in order to achieve the same amount of work. Not a good plan.

no! too harsh and it would not solve the problem it would work like a tax raising the price of all vehicles and travel in general. the idea represents unfair taxation also. Perhaps the missouls valley but not the whole state! This should be local legislation, not state wide.
Hell no!

I'm not sure that California is a good model to follow, although I do believe that standards are needed.

I left california to get away from over regulation and power crazed legislators.

THIS WOULD CHANGE MONTANA AS WE KNOW IT IT IS ALREADY HARD FOR THE AVERAGE MONTANA RESIDENT TO BUY & OWN A VEHICLE THIS WOULD LEAVE PEOPLE WITH OUT TRANSPORTATION AND RUIN THE AUTO INDUSTRY ECONOMY

No!!! This places a burden on the consumers of Montana and there are no real benefits.

Montana is not California with its big cities. This would limit the availability of light trucks and full-size cars in Montana and drive up the costs of vehicles.

this should have been done years ago.

Most Montanan's can't afford to do that. Get real. This is not California. California's about to go bankrupt folks.

Like I said, this is not California. If you want to be like California then move there.

We do not need to have California lead us around.

no.

I am insulted you would even suggest this.

Establish time frame.

I think we will find in the near future that even California's standards were not high enough--the technology has been there for a very long time to improve emissions, instead we built Hummers, we will be paying for this in a big way in the future

This will put more pressure on auto manufactures to produce clean cars.

This recommendation will drive up costs to consumers in Montana. Given the types of vehicles Montanans use, specifically light trucks, this recommendation could have a profound impact in Montana that is not shared in other areas of the country.

No. No. No. California is a unique case. Uniquely nutty. You just watch their economy cave in. Forget it. Only if the national standard matches CA should Montana adopt.

Not worth expense with polulation.

CA standards have had a enormous impact on cutting emissions and should be adopted by all states.

This is Montana...if you like the California standards, move there.

Strenuously oppose this proposal -- would increase cost of fuel.

Yes! Do more and sooner than the federal standards.

This may need a grandfather clause and could be a problem here--it will be very prohibitive to many Montanans who would not be able to afford the inspections and the widespread fraud that many Californians have suffered. Higher standards on new cars is a better solution.

AND ALL SUV's

Montana is too sparsley populated and too rural. The independent nature of our consumers would disagree with this policy, as do I. The infrastructure isn't here to support adoption of these standards.

It will cost the driver now, but pay off later.

Totally unnecessary and Montanans can't afford it.

YES

Federal standards will be appropriate for Montana

Not only No, but HELL NO! We are an independent State, and need to remain that way.

how do you spell ..DUMB...DUM or California emissions

YES! Absolutely as soon as possible.

It is extremely difficult to pull a loaded stock trailer with a 4 cylinder mini-car! Pickup trucks need to have enough horsepower to do work. It's a nice idea to burn less fuel and release less emissions, but it's also necessary to have enough power to haul livestock, hay, etc. in a safe manner.

YES!!! We need this badly!!

Tax incentives for higher gas milage vehicles

Montana is NOT California!

Do this on a federal level - do not make us less competative.

Catch the leading wave.

Does Montana want to be like the hypocritical Califhories.

Pulitzer Peace Prize Winner Dr. Steve Running: Drive 65, no more.

I guess its ok

Smog checks to eliminate the worst offending old clunkers should have been in place years ago.

This is Montana NOT CA.

please do this, we need vehicle inspections and vehicle emissions testing

Federal government regs are abysmal, it's past time to set higher standards.

the earth only has one atmosphere so why would we want different standards for different areas of the earth? The highest and best standard should be what all of us are attempting to achieve

California did it so can Montana!

Stay out of this one. Why does Montana have to follow CA lead when we dont have the population or industry or have the problems they do? Do we need more regulation?

Why should we follow California's "lead", when numerous studies are showing what they are doing is not necessarily what is best for our country? Blindly following a state simply because they are active about doing "something" is no guarantee that what they are doing is what is the right thing.

As a consideration adopt and annual or biannual mandatory vehicle inspection program ---similar to WA and CA and others so that exhaust emmsiions can be measured and only those meeting minimum standards can be licensed. It would be an immediate imporvement and get the old gas guzzling oil burners off the road.

I HAVE A CA VEHICLE PURCHASED THERE WITH THE "LOCKED BOX COMPUTER" UN-ADJUSTABLE BY CA LAW---AS BY CA LAW, THE COMPUTER IS "SET" BY CA 02 LAW---TRIED TO HAVE THE BOX RE-SET FOR THIS ALTITUDE TO INCREASE MILAGE AND DECREASE EMISSIONS---IMPOSSIBLE---04 JEEP FOR SALE!!! AND AT A AVERAGE -3K DEVALUATION BECAUSE OF THE CA STANDARD LOCKED BOX---YA, LETS LET CA SET OUR LAWS, WE CAN SAVE A BUNCH BY NOT HAVING TO PAY OUR LEGISLATORS TO "DO THIER JOBS"

Why not adopt ahead of California. Why do we not have better mileage standards on light trucks.

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

Stupid is and stupid does --

yes, we should join the other states

THIS IS COOL

We agree that the standards should be adopted, but should not be greater than Federal Standards. Many of the standards adopted in California have forced companies to move to surrounding states. Montana's standards should be based on Montana's requirements.

This is MT - why are we thinking we can do this with less than a million people? The federal gov't is working on this.

The full affect of CA standards is not yet being seen. Car manufacturers have said that they cannot meet those standards in many vehicles. In order to meet the standards, they will change the "mix" of vehicles shipped to the state for sale (it's done on an average of all vehicles sold) They estimate they would need to reduce the shipment of SUV's and light trucks to MT by 60%. These are the primary vehicles sold in MT.

Adopt higher standards for all vehicles. Drop the tax breaks on large SUV's.(Hummers) My wife and I looked in earnest for a new car this winter and were amazed at how poor the fuel economy standards were on even small sedans. Would welcome taxbreaks for electric cars w/100 mile range like General Motors E-1 (see "Who killed the electric car"

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

More nanny state actions. Who is going to pay for all of this. Once political brain trust destories the economy with all this hype?

ABSOLUTELY NOT. Keep California and their insane Berkeley developed laws OUT of Montana!!!

Bad idea, let's not have more legislation, and more excuse for increased government spending.

No more California!

Increase public transportation so that it is very user friendly, frequent, cost effective.

absolutely not. We are a large unpopulated stste. Get off this kick of leading. Represent MONTANANS and do what is best for us!!!!!!!!!!

Montana should be able to decide for ourselves for the standards pertinent to Montana, NOT California Let's remember that California caused the energy crisis of 2000, by ramping up consumption but refusing, because of environmentalists yelling "not in my backyard" to build any new generating capacity for TWENTY YEARS. Then they bankrupted their utilities and used FERC to force out of state generators to continue to sell to them, causing a ripple effect that devastated montana's economy (i.e., directly causing the closure of the Butte mines and Columbia Falls Aluminum). NO, this was not the result of deregulation. Unfortunately for that argument, Idaho's power went up more in price and they DID NOT DEREGULATE. So the deregulation argument is untrue. The truth is that California's boneheaded energy policy led to a crisis both there and here. We should not copy one single thing that California does in the area of energy policy.

I know of the mess that is happening down there and the large amount of fees required to monitor this process. This would only increase all fees to the consumers only to provide for more bureaucracy. I would rather have the state of Montana lead than follow what the extreme liberal state of California is doing. I am certain that the great people of the state of Montana would not want to follow a state that continually proves to the rest of the U.S. how they can legislate people to death. I believe in narrowing the green house gases but do not believe we need to go such dire extremes as California has done.

We do not need to fund another state agency.

California standards were written for ozone non attainment and generally are not the best answer for GHGs.

A serious evaluation of costs to Montana consumers should be conducted before adopting California standards. What would be impacts on Montana auto dealerships (providers of good paying jobs and benefits). Which auto manufacturers have the ability to meet these standards and at what volume and cost? What kind of regulation regime is necessary? Are there unintended consequences by forcing residents to keep older vehicles longer, rather than upgrading to newer models?

Yes, thank you. If not implemented, I may consider buying a car in California!

There are already CAFE standards in place to increase mileage and reduce emissions significantly. Implementing California standards will: reduce the type of vehicles that can be sold in Montana, limit allocations of light trucks and SUV's, limit availability of diesels, give up control to California, and increase car buyer's costs up to \$3000 per vehicle.