

TLU-2 Comments
Recommendation 27
Fuel efficient replacement tires program

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision. There are far more important qualities of tires than their rolling resistance. Montana is not known for its uniformity in road surfaces. Try testing rolling resistance on a gravel road or in snow rather than the test surfaces specified by the testing standard.

These are steps that can be taken immediately.

Have you ever tried to run a low rolling resistance tire on icy Montana roads? Even with 4-wheel drive, they are dangerous. Are you going to require our Highway Patrol to drive the bad roads on these things?

Safety for Montana drivers should be first and foremost. Montanans should be able to drive whatever tires they wish to buy, depending on their needs.

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.

Such a small step can make such a difference?

This should be accomplished at the national level or by a coalition of western states including California. Montana has too few people to be setting tire standards.

Could cause problems for rural Montanans who need better off road capabilities than most Americans.

No opinion

I agree with this as long as the new tires are as safe and stable as the tires we are using now. With the extreme roads on which many Montanans drive, safety needs to come first.

There is a question of the efficacy and safety of LRR tires in snow and ice conditions.

Let the feds lead.

Let the market do its job. If a product exists to improve fuel efficiency, people will buy it to save money. Remove the subsidies that thwart the market doing its job.

Why just a portion?

\$\$\$ cost to consumers --

Rural areas and their vehicle needs are completely forgotten in this one. Try driving on Montana's rural roads with these standards and see how long your tires last.

Manufacturers are going to react to the Montana market? Quit smokin that stuff!

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

Do this through incentives - not legislation

How much more expensive are these tires? How will these tires affect our highways and calculation of allowable GVW? Like so many of these recommendations if they really produce the projected results, then they should occur without government mandates.

I would support consumer-based incentives to encourage adoption of LRR tires rather than special Montana-only requirements.

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.

Will increase winter driving accidents. Increased milage can more easily be accomplished by proper tire inflation.

I do not see this as necessary.

Sounds like a great way to kill more drivers on Montana's roads. Friction is what provides skid resistance.

This one is hard considering our road conditions in the winter. I would not want to create a less safe driving environment - we already have a high death toll due to car accidents in Montana.

Spitting in the wind. Follow national vehicle standards. Participate in commissions/standards bodies. MT has no business setting new standards as simply economically not feasible.

ok, but stay away from legislating this.

I'm not sure that I want to pay more or be required to buy low rolling resistance tires when what I need are the opposite.

I think it would be wiser to target the sales, rather than worry about existing tires.

as long as the new tires are safe for weather conditions common in Montana-snow, ice...

The safety of such tires in snow and ice has not been well documented. We should not jeopardize our employee's safety before assuring the reliability of this technology in our driving conditions. Fuel improvement efficiency is too small to be worth additional regulation. Consumers should not be required to buy more expensive replacement tires.

Does the 4.5% gain in fuel economy pay for the extra cost of the tires

This is the simplest way to increase fuel efficiency in motor vehicles. Clarify the standard to include SUVs expressly.

Again-increased cost and availability. Every state vehicle will need their tires replaced by then anyway. Where is the cost-benefit analysis?

I am a bike rider. I know what rolling resistance is. It is directly relateable to vehicle tires. Everyone who is opposed should have to ride a bike to work every day for a year. Then they will know. Snow tires would be the exception. Off-roading tires should not be exempted. I just changed to low resistance tires today on my bike. Gads! what a difference, energy wise.

It would be great if this was accompanied by a good recycling program for the old tires. probably a duplication of a federal standard

Unrealistic in reality, but a nice idea if such tires become available.

Let the consumer decide what tires they want to use!!! The state should not be setting any standards on replacement tires.

WHAT ABOUT SNOW TIRES? WILL THEY BE BANNED? HOW MUCH WILL THESE TIRES COST? WILL WE HAVE TO DRIVE ON SLICK AND DANGEROUS TIRES BECAUSE WE CAN'T AFFORD THIS NEW STUFF?

Sounds okay. Need more analysis.

How do LRR tires do in ice and snow? Couldn't we get more immediate results by keeping our existing tires inflated?

Address the tire problem with incentives to keep them inflated!

This seems so simple and so effective.

let the market determine this

low rolling resistance? On ice?

State should lead by example. Incentives for voluntary adoption.

Set a high bar!

Couldn't we get more immediate results by keeping our existing tires inflated? How do LRR tires do in ice and snow and on gravel roads?

Government control over we the people our constitution forbids this kind of control over we the people

ONce upon a time, truck regulations were considered to prevent the use of high pressure tires because of the dramatic effect on highway pavement. Has this impact been analyzed?

Implementing prior to 2009 would be good. The technology has been around for a long time. Implementation must need to come from government or they would have introduced the technology years ago when the corporates bought the technology and filed it in some hidden filing cabinet.

Just add a few more pounds pressure to existing tires and you will get the same results for NOTHING!

While it might be acceptable for the state to put such tires on its vehicles, they should not place such a mandate upon their citizens.

How do these tires perform in winter weather? My experience has been most do not do well at all. we in the private sector are broke, these ideas cost money, eliminate 50% government jobs and force them to get real jobs creating wealth instead of stealing wealth

So, sticking your noses even more in people's private lives by forcing them to buy or sell more expensive tires to save a few pennies on gas mileage?

sounds good, dont throw all of those tires away, recycle them or donate them to cities for plant holders. something would need to happen to them

Low rolling resistance = low friction = poor performance on Montana's roads.

Again, cost effectiveness is a concern.

Are you going to take ALL decisions out of the individual's hands?????

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.

Most new purchases should already be equipped. the motor pool should be assessing the effectiveness and safety of these tires.

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

What a joke see testimony at initial hearing on this last month. Tires are round!

While your figure are right, How much CO2 emission are we going to reduce in Montana. Is it worth the hassel, and the cost. We will have a new department within and agency to regulate the tire I want to put on my car. Most of the benefit are outweighed by having more government regulations.

People will buy into this without you mandating it. Leave it alone.
Too far fetched.

Offer incentives for meeting the standard, not mandatory adoption.

Proven to be unsafe.

Funded by the people again.

These tires would cause a lot more wrecks on ice than we already have.

These tires are dangerous. California didn't even adopt this part.

once again at what cost? Once it becomes a requirement it drives the prices up.

I CAN'T EVEN BELIEVE THIS IS BEING SUGGESTED. IF YOU WANT TO REPLACE STATE OWNED VEHICLE TIRES AS THEY NEED REPLACING FINE, AS LONG AS THEY DON'T INCREASE TAXES FOR THE AVERAGE MONTANAN.

MDT itself has opposed bills that would allow these tires to be used in Montana on Commercial Motor Vehicles. Reason pavement damage. Until this study has been completed and approved by MDT this would not be a good option. On passenger vehicles these tires do not work well in winter on Montana roads. I have personally experience poor gripping in winter weather with these tires and have opted for others when worn out.

Have you looked at the price of low rolling resistance tires?

MDT itself has opposed bills that would allow these tires to be used in Montana on Commercial Motor Vehicles. Reason pavement damage. Until this study has been completed and approved by MDT this would not be a good option. On passenger vehicles these tires do not work well in winter on Montana roads. I have personally experience poor gripping in winter weather with these tires and have opted for others when worn out.

low rolling resistance tires will be unsafe for the traveling public due to lower frictional contact with the road surface.

I like programs that get down to the people. They are the ones that need to make this happen.

It's a great idea, if its possible...and economically feasible.

We must remember that we still have winter here, and whatever is saved through LRR tires will be lost through slind off of the road

Let the market decide what tires you should use. So much for freedom. I hate when you socialist, I mean democrats get into office.

too expensive

This has been a failure where tried. There are too many vehicles that demand off road tires in our state.

STUPID STUPID STUPID. IF consumers want low rolling resistance tires, they will ask for them!!!!!!

You've got to be kidding.

Energy efficiency standards need to be mandatory, not voluntary.

Let the market prevail, not more government.

Hell Yes! State vehicles is our money that is being given away.

as long as they are as safe as currently tested tires and preformance is not replaced...such as snow tires etc

Have you ever tried to drive on snow and ice with these tires? The money you save on fuel costs will be drastically offset by vehicle damage and possible deaths in the winter months. Low rolling resistance tires cannot provide adequate and safe operation in Montana's constantly changing climate. In the sunny state of California, yes. In Montana, no.

raises cost, might have safety hazards

"Government is not the solution to our problems, it IS the problem"

Do not compromise safety.

We sould do this only when it is cost efective.

the private sector would accomplish this without government interference if it made sense.

As long as they are good quality and last and prices don't increase.

This sounds good on paper, but in implementation, we might get poorer quality, more expensive tires. Is the technology there and proven? Are we trying to force technology?

Would these new tires be safe?

Tire efficiency.....most people never bother to check their air pressure now.....by doing so, one can achieve at least a 20% increase in gas mileage, on the same old tires as always. State owned vehicles will get best fuel economy when they are driven the speed limit!!!!

You mean reduce the coefficient of friction so highway fatalities will increase? Isn't that the tavern associations goal? What good are state rights if your legislature is less intelligent than the Feds?

Not available in small rural areas. Not feasible on rough gravel roads or wet, slippery gumbo.

FREE MARKET principles MUST govern what business does.

Again, YES

Has value if reasonably done.

This says nothing. Set a standard that isn't available yet, then adopt it as tires become available! (HUH??) Rolling resistance ratings for tires is available now.

I wonder what the effectiveness of a 'voluntary energy efficiency standard' would be?

I am in favor of this, however it would result in increased costs for consumers.

I feel labeling would be beneficial to the consumer but not minimal requirements for the manufacturer.

This is not realistic for Montanans. And I don't care for anyone telling me what type of tire I have to buy for my personal or work vehicles. This committee, nor the legislature doesn't run my business--I do. And what will be done with all the tires that are replaced? The environmentalists only want to recycle what they want--they don't want to let the cement plants burn them. Another bad idea.

Tire manufacturers are doing this on their own. Another waste of money.

Why not mandate more fuel efficient cars and trucks for the state fleets? Push the manufacturers to develop fuel efficiency. Use these low rolling efficiencies as a last resort.

Need to understand full impact.

Our biggest opportunities will be with renewable energy sources to run our buildings - let's go with the big stuff first and not micro-manage.

How do these tires handle a Montana winter? What safety standards do they meet? Just another way for government to force us to spend, spend, spend.

The recommendation needs more analysis. There is a large body of research done on a national level that shows a relationship between high pressure tires (aka fuel efficient tires) and extreme pavement damage. Care should be used to ensure that this recommendation does not have severe impacts to Montana's surface transportation system.

Too costly.

This seems too easy. Somebody should have already started this.

The citizens of the State of Montana still, and of right, ought to be able to choose their own brand of tires they desire on their vehicle. Get real!

Would low rolling resistance outweigh safety and utility in the tires?

This is not needed, and the State should stay away from this.

NO MANDATES

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.

I would like to see safety studies on low rolling resistance tires, which includes performance in different types of weather.

Too many variables

An unnecessary worry.

Now you plan to tax that poor S.O.B. who runs a tire shop. Have you any idea about how hard they work to pay your taxes? This one is pernicious.

Who pays for this - NOT THE MANUFACTURER - it is passed on to the consumer.

Fuel efficiency is definitely important. I know that if I could easily find tires that would increase fuel efficiency and the cost to benefit ratio were reasonably in-line without sacrificing safety, I would definitely take a hard look at them.

In the meantime, EDUCATE people as to the value of putting ENOUGH AIR in their tires TODAY. The savings will ASTOUND them..

not good

I have been advised that this would be a dangerous replacement in snow conditions.

Retailers object to any policy requiring them to label tires, outside of the federal label requirements. This greatly increases costs to retailers.

once again this is Mt, tell me again how the traction is going up Monida Pass in winter .

If it can be done efficiently, you have my support

Apparently this is a big deal...

Low rolling resistance tires use a harder rubber formula causing them not to grip as well. I smell a law suit on the first state owned vehicle that slides into Joe public's car.

not sure on this one?

How do these perform in the snow and ice?

Statistics indicate that less than 60% of drivers check their tire pressure. Proper tire inflation would yield an increase in fuel economy but I'm uncertain as to how you encourage the public to be more responsible. Possibly this could be combined with TLU-3.

How safe would these tires be on wet and icy roads? rolling resistance sounds like slipping.

EXCELLENT !!! I hadn't even heard of this, and will look into it for my own vehicle, a Honda Civic Hybrid.

If it's truly a better tire with an economic advantage AND no disadvantages, the market does not need to have the government mandate this. Keep the government out of it.

tires are the reason cars don't crash off the road. Montana is not a good place to experiment with new fangled low resistance tires! here, hold my beer, I'll show you!

Standards must take into account the need for traction in snow and ice.

pinhead idea?

These tires aren't available in rural Montana. The majority of our roads are dirt roads making this not feasible.

Once again what starts off as voluntary changes to a mandate. Where is the research to show how these tires would work in Montana's climate? How much more would they cost?

Limit it to State owned vehicles. Leave the citizens to decide for themselves.

Might work if there is major improvement on the roads.

Not too bad in idea, but would cost the state a lot of money. Labels on tires are not too bad, BUT we cannot be the only state doing it.

Make tire replacement mandatory, not voluntary.

The recommendation needs more analysis. There is a large body of research done on a national level that shows a relationship between high pressure tires (aka fuel efficient tires) and extreme pavement damage. Care should be used to ensure that this recommendation does not have severe impacts to Montana's surface transportation system.

Are you kidding me? When they come on the market, IF they do, then consumers can decide. Good grief!

Many of us in Eastern Montana have slippery gumbo when it rains and graveled roads to drive. LRR tires don't stand up to our needs.

Educate and let the consumers make the right decisions

Fuel efficient tires are not always the best choice in Montana's varied weather conditions. We do not need regulations to stand in the way for intelligent citizens to make common sense choices!

If we can buy a good strong tire, that will bear a load, for a decent price, it's a good idea. If these tires won't bear loads, aren't safe on snow/ice, or are cost-prohibitive, we shouldn't be forced to use them.

More beurocratic crap.

Drive 65, put speed governors on state vehicles. AND save lives!

maybe

Just require all state employees to walk rather than drive state vehicles. If they don't like it, give them their walking papers.

I don't think LRR are a 4 season tire. If Montana had one season...

Need consumer education component which should reassure people of the tires' safety on icy or wet roads

I am not competent to comment on this item

Use nitrogen. It helps with longer tire wear.

Question whether that would work for wiinter tires. Those should be exempt for safety reasons.

as long as there is no restriciton on seasonal/winter use of mud/snow/ice treads. All season tires can and are unsafe for many during the winter months.

ANOTHER "DRAG" ON THE CONSUMER ESPECIALLY SINCE MOST DRIVERS DON'T BOTHER TO CHEC TIRE PRESSURES NOW!!!

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

Voluntary is not enough.

completely unenforcable, market demand will take care of this anyway

The additional wear and tear on Montana roads from this type of tires and the resultant additional construction costs and associated pollution needs to be considered along with the fuel saving.

Good idea, but poor implementation in MT alone. Needs to be pursued nationally.

I've heard these tires may not be safe or applicable in a climate like Montana where we can have harsh winters

If these tires are safe and improve gas mileage, consumers will buy them without government intervention.

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

Market forces and gas prices will drive this to change

The State should consider all opportunities to improve vehicle fuel efficiency, including low-rolling resistance (LRR) replacement tires. However, the State should embrace environmentally-sound management and disposal options for the subsequent scrap tires.

Do low rolling resistance tires perform well in rain, snow, ice, or mud conditions? If not, this could be of dubious benefit in terms of safe driving.

greater than 4.5% gain in fuel economy

If it is truly voluntary

We cannot access surroundings without studded snow tires.

We can start with all state owned vehicles and if it works then we can change.

So do I have to put these on my truck when I am going up in the hills? Who handles the liability associated with any crashes associated with mandated tires. I buy cheap tires can you subsidize my tires.

Need more information. Energy requirements for producing a tire vs. energy saved by low rolling resistance costs. Is life of tire equivalent to current tire choices? Is there enough supply to meet the forced demand?