

TLU-12 Comments
Recommendation 37
Reduced GHG emissions from aviation

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

So if California adopts these emissions standards, will Montana immediately jump on the band wagon? At what cost? If you get lower CO2 emissions are there other impacts on engine performance?

Off road use for recreation purposes should carry a very high tax.

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.

I put "5" with caveat that this should be done regardless of what other states do. It makes no sense to leave an entire class of motor vehicle -- perhaps the fastest growing class -- unregulated for GHG. I would add that lawnmowers and other gas-powered home equipment produce considerable quantities of GHG. I have read studies claiming that an average riding mowers produce the equivalent in 7 hours of use of an average car in 100,000 miles of driving. I can't vouch for that stat, but regardless mowers and other equipment also need incentives and regulations to dramatically reduce their GHG emissions.

What is meant by "if other states take the lead"? How many other states?

Why do we need to wait for other states to take the lead for CO2 emissions standards for OTR equipment?

Why should we do things just because other states do it????? If it is right to do then we should do it. If not then scrap the idea.

Forget this business about other states taking the lead. We should be worried about Montana not what those backwards folks in Idaho and Utah are doing.

Why do we have to wait for other states to do this?

Lead by adopting emission standards first

Enough already.

I would put recreational vehicles at the top of the list. If people have the money to spend on such toys, the standards should be at the highest level.

No! No! No! This is a federal matter!

Do we not have our own initiative? Does this include the agricultural industry? Are we growing our economy with this measure?

Remove the subsidies that encourage this bad behavior, and the retrofits will occur in the free market. Without subsidies, they will be forced to meet the public health and environmental standards.

Why should other states take the lead?..

This should and can be done. Montana has many off road vehicles. This action would move manufacturers to build a cleaner product. They WON'T till states implement actions like this.

Establish a heavy tax on ORV vehicles and/or GHG emissions, with exemptions for non-recreational ORV use.

Again, why not 100%?

Somebody finally figured out that other states with larger markets need to take the lead!

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

Why don't we take the lead. We need to be thought leaders and set good examples.

Seems ambiguous to tie to any "other state or municipality". Some state with very little off-road vehicles may adopt a "feel good" standard, which would trigger Montana adopting such a standard. Let's just suppose that Burbank, California adopts a standard for self propelled lawn maintenance equipment-do we follow?

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. Who cares what other states do. Be a leader, not a sheep.

Why wait for another state? We should create our own standards now.

Yes! Montana should lead by example not wait for another state to establish standards.

These vile stinkers need to be done away with altogether. Discourage adult children from dirty outdoor play.

Why do other states have to take the lead?

NO MORE 2 stroke engines!!!

Montana should take the lead. Don't bank our programs on other state's taking the initiative.

Eliminate off road in national parks including snow mobiles!@

Existing Federal standards are adequate.

Why wait let's be the first state.

This should include snowmobiles leaving West Yellowstone, & other Yellowstone Park Gateways

Why wait for other states to take the lead?

IC, fossil-fuel off road vehicles should be illegal. All recreational activities should exhibit zero-carbon-footprint. What good is outdoor recreation that destroys the very resource it celebrates?

The government should not legislate off-road equipment. This is a personal choice that does not come under government purview.

Where is all this money going to come from for the various suggestions that require state buildings and vehicles to retrofit?

Why don't we take the lead????

It would be fine for Montana to take the lead. Let's get serious about these issues.

Yes, 2-stroke engines should be phased out!

Don't wait for another state to adopt this standard. Why can't Montana be the state to start the trend. If all other states are waiting for someone to step up to the plate nothing will ever get accomplished. Be a leader not a follower.

This violates the Montana constitution by binding legislative action to actions not in the control of the legislature.

Montana should not be adopting standards more stringent than federal requirements.

Why can't we take the lead? Strong recreation state here, folks. 4-cycle ATV's available? Sure made a difference in snow mobile noise and air pollution. Might make non-motorized users a little less frustrated, too.

as well as lawn mowers, blowers, snow maintenance equipment

We should set the standard, not another state.

ORVs are a top priority as are lawn mowers, etc. Far more polluting than cars.

why can't we take the lead-if we can work out a block of rocky mountain states with the same standards-manufacturers will not be able to just sell elsewhere

or restrict off road vehicles and/or heavily tax them

Who is paying for the tax incentives?? There is no free lunch-someone has to pay for-provide the incentives.

why wait for other states lets take the lead

Why wait for other states? Why can't Montana be in the lead?

Again you are not considering the laws of physics.

Studies show that there is zero climate benefit to such investments. Clearly there is no concensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

NOW WE ARE REALLY GETTING TO CORE OF IT. YES, I AM KILLING YOU WITH MY ATV. THIS SOUNDS LIKE THE PLAN TO PUT SOME KIND OF METHANE COLLECTOR DEVICE ON COW BUTTS. WE ARE REALLY ENTERING THE TWILIGHT ZONE OF SANITY HERE.

Definitely adopt CO2 emission standards. Establish disincentives for motorized recreation, ie voluntary carbon emission.

Too little too late. The effort should be focused on the manufacturers.

this is miniscule - the cost would not yield any benefit

don't wait for another state

Protect pristine areas by increasing emission standards. These vehicles are often recreational and it is ones choice to use these vehicles.

Why only if other states take the lead?

Set the standard. Don't wait for other states to get on board.

Establish disincentives for recreational vehicles.

This should happen nationally. This will impact ag and make our products less competitive and hurt the people we are trying to help.

Emissions from this type equipment is inconsequential. What a waste of time and money.

NO. We set the standard if no one else is. Why wait?

While it is probably acceptable for the state to lead by example, this should not be a mandate upon the citizens.

Montana should do this regardless of other states; let's be a leader.

the market share for these is insignificant and not worth the costs

I like it!

where is all this money coming from?

Getting old-sounds good, but who is going to pay for this?

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states.

retrofitting is not an economic activity. replace with compliant equipment when the time comes

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

good luck getting any work done!

leave us alone!!!

Montana is Montana! No justification to mandate more costs on the industries that support our state. Again CO2 emission reduction at the expense of performance here in Montana can be detrimental.

Since when is Montana a follower. if it is right to do, and i don't believe it is, Why wait. If the issue is so crucial we should do it now. but it is not.

Strongly opposed to this, copying California again. Machine density is too low for any net effect. Might make YOU feel good, but won't have any genuine impact.

Do not adopt emission standards of other states. Just phase in better equipment as old equipment becomes defunct. Set the date out to 2020.

A bit hit on private recreational vehicles.

No big deal. Let us not follow but use our own brains.

Adopt standards whether or not other states take lead

Bad for Ag, will drive food prices up further.

How will you enforce? These vehicles aren't normally licensed. Will we create an off road police force to ride around off road and check emission? Will the results be commensurate with the cost?

But lets not make it so impractical that these vehicles are extinguished from Montana. They are a big part of our economy

MT should take the lead, if everyone state said "within two years of another state" how would the action ever occur.

This should be a national requirement.

eliminate 2 cycle engines would help

What is wrong with you people. Cows emit more methane and emissions than ATVs but I don't here you regulating the ranchers. Start there if you are serious about climate change. God forbid if the ranchers pay any taxes.

Support if restricted to state motor pool. Lead by example.

So gonna follow California again? Another State or municipality? Watch out for San Fran & Missoula.

Anything to eliminate ATVs!

Why can't MT take the lead??? Or at least lead an effort among states?

State of Montana take the lead for CO2 emission standards!

Ban all 2-stroke jet skis and snowmobiles.

Consumption of forests may account for more CO2 emissions than the transportation sector. If anything, control of emissions from the logging sector much match, if not exceed, controls of emissions from transportation.

raise costs

NO!

Yes, though I would like Montana to take the lead in this. Does this include motor boats?

Reduce the amount of off-road vehicles allowed to travel off-road on illegal paths and trails on public lands everywhere in the state and get cooperation from federal agencies

Again, there is no Carbon crisis so why cure a cold that doesn't exist.

Purchasing more efficient vehicles to replace aging vehicles may be a worthy goal, but retrofitting existing vehicles (publicly and privately owned) is an unnecessary intrusion and expense.

I do not support this in the least.

Good idea.

must do

I support this but....2010 is only two years away. Are there other states or municipalities anywhere close to doing this? Seems like retrofitting 40% of state off-road vehicles by 2010 is a moot point if no other states are taking the lead. Why don't we take the lead and let others follow?

I don't know how the retrofits might impact the vehicle's safety, performance and longevity. Are you thinking hard about unintended consequences?

Do you mean California!

Lead by example very good indeed. Why not retrofit 100% of state owned off road vehicles?

Get real!

Should be stronger for "optional" or "recreational" vehicles.

In this state there is already a common knowledge that there is not enough law enforcement to enforce many of the States laws nor enough fines or jails to make a point to those that choose to break it. So, where as this speaks to the GHG problems, without solid enforcement capabilities it will not be adhered to by enough people.

Absolutely necessary

At what cost to me for these engines? What no guts? Want a stupid mandate like this just jump out there in front. Why wait for someone else? Spend tax dollars for retrofits.

I support this plan, but why can't we take the lead? We have enough off-road vehicle issues, it would be nice if we won one of those battles definitively.

Why if other states take the lead?

This should be regulated at the Federal level. Not the State. Off-road vehicles do need to have stricter standards.

Standards for recreational ORVs should be strict & w/o subsidies for compliance. These are TOYS.

Eliminate private off-road vehicles from National Forests and Parks and this disappears. People need to exercise and get fit these days. Folks using these items should be charged additional taxes for fueling these off-road vehicles. These should be left to the resource agencies for use in managing these facilities.

Scientific theories on global warming do not warrant new taxes or legislation. Need additional analysis to understand impact on consumers and penalties on business development.

Once again focus on the big issues that are the problem do not kill the little man - he is nearly dead if you have not noticed. Use phase outs of old technologies to avoid expenses. New product high standards Why? CO2 is good for the plants, they use it to make carbohydrates from CO2 and Water.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Good idea, but I think again, it will be costly to the state to retrofit.

NO No NO NO

Why do other states need to take the lead? Montana has an enormous recreational ORV population. Why not lead by example?

Poor, poor idea. Good for the wealthy, bad for the poor.

Not needed. Just another tax burden.

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.

No mandating. Benefits derived should be the incentive

Montana should take the lead in adopting CO2 emissions standards for off-road equipment.

You are now close to fomenting rebellion.

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING IS BASED ON JUNK SCIENCE. PLEASE DO THE RESEARCH AND DON'T STEAL FROM THE PUBLIC THAT YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT!

Stay away from our toys!!!

Again, don't make us subject to programs that may work in another state and not here.

Ban the Off-road ATV's, (snowmobiles) that require oil mixed in w/ the gasoline. Period.

ARE WE GOING TO MAKE A STATE PARK OUT OF MT . WHO WILL PAY YOUR WAGES THEN GOV.

If this is cost(fuel) efficient it will happen.

excellent idea!

If this includes tractors for farming it will not help us.

Did you pick up your map to I-15 yet?

Would Montana set the pace for this, by becoming the first state to adopt these measures?

Recreational vehicles should be taxed since they are not essential.

I would go further and phase out all fossil fuel recreational off-road vehicles in MT.

Snowmobiles-no longer allowed-also-no private ATV,s to speak of.

This is a long overdue action on a significant pollution source.

good one.

This should be done regardless of what other states do

Again, this seems like a minor source and we could probably get a bigger bang for the buck in other areas.

An important category, indeed. Eventually, drivers of such vehicles will feel good about what they are doing to help (after they've been forced to do it for awhile). :-)

I am beginning to think that the committee's goal is to cripple every industry in the state. How are farms, ranches & small businesses supposed to survive these types of regulations. It will put people out of business.

Tax payer money for small benefit..

Off-road vehicles do not pollute as much as the hot air from Helena.

NO!!

Would be expensive requirement for those who enjoy motorized recreation and for farmers and ranchers. Bad idea to tie to other states or municipalities that may be very different from Montana.

Limit your rules to yourself. i.e. State owned vehicles only.

Raise this 40% to 80%.

Can't afford the engine power loss.

Why do other states have to take the lead?

NO> Off road. NO. Even lawn mowers and model airplanes? NO.

Excellent.

Don't wait for the other states!!

a 4 stroke snowmobile is much more comfortable to ride than a 2 stroke. They would not be producing 4 stroke models if Yellowstone had not mandated it.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Oh, right, if Oakland CA adopts, we will? Pshaw.

Very little pay backs for cost because of large landscape.

If another state or municipality jumped off a bridge, would you, within 2 years? Please do not lead by example on this. See TLU-7.

All state vehicles should be scrapped and all employess should ride bicycles...or horses. I mean, this is Montana.

Why not lead the way and set the CO2 emission standards first?

I don't agree with setting CO2 emission standards. This would be a huge and expensive burden on agriculture with all of the off-road equipment we use.

This is a big one.

Costs would be vastly more than any benefits.

Apply national standards

Don't forget that all other states don't have the same heavy equipment requirements we do in our mining and logging industries in mountainous country. One size might not fit all!

retrofits are always expensive and sometimes make the difference in a small business or small farm for the business to keep going.

Especially recreational vehicles.

There are more dangerous gasses that comes from engines, not just CO2.

Why don't we take the lead? Off road equipment pollutes worse than most vehicles.

We should not wait for someone else to take the lead.

AS I SAID BEFORE---ANOTHER ATTACK ON THE RECREATIONAL USER ALREADY PAYING THE BRUNT OF THE BILLS---ANY TIME YOU BURN FUEL CARBON DIOXIDE IS RELEASED--- DURING PHOTOSYNTHESIS TOO!!!!

Why not be a leader?

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

too expensive

This should be looked at nationally. MT is a drop in the bucket.

We have no control over "other municipalities". What would stop some little town in southern CA from placing emission standards that are so unreasonable that they are essentially a "ban" on snowmobiles and 4 wheelers? They would have nothing to lose. Yellowstone already has emission standards. Is that a "municipality"? If so, we do not want to adopt only 4 stroke engines in snowmobiles. They are not only not readily available, their performance is poor.

I think the state could easily attain 100% retrofit on state-owned ORVs; also state should seriously evaluate the need for and number of ORVs in the fleet.

I have always wanted to see electric snow mobiles, especially in Yellowstone national park. tax incentives or exclusive contracts.

Why wait for other states to act?

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

national program needed

"...another...municipality" where? In another state, or could it be in Montana?

Why wait for another state or municipality?

I am totally leary of following other states

Stop following the other states. Let's try to be proactive in our thoughts. This is the difference between leaders and followers. If other states have better technology, let's take a look at it and see how it can best fit into this state's uses.

As far as I am concerned, off road vehicles are an option of choice for transportation, not a vital need. They need to come into compliance at an earlier date than that necessary for day to day transportation.

Only if private funds are used, no tax payer dollars.