

TLU-5 Comments
Recommendation 30
Growth and development bundle

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

So far, this is the only one of these ideas that really makes sense.

The developer doesn't pay impact fees! Homeowners do! This entire area only adds to the cost of housing in Montana. I thought we were supposed to be concerned about affordable housing?!

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.

LARGER GOVT must be better, right? Current Smart Growth organizations are NOT good for rural Montana.

Of these ideas, I support two: establishing a state-level Community Technical Assistance Program on smart growth; and allowing local option fuel or sales taxes or developer impact fees to help local government fund transportation infrastructure to support policies.

Do we really need a separate technical assistance program for smart growth? Shouldn't that already be done through DOC's Community Technical Assistance Program? Local governments can have their Growth Policies (GP) contain a statement that state buildings should be located in the "core business centers" (is that downtown?) but GPs are not regulatory, and the State can trump whatever a GP says in addition to overriding a community's zoning if push comes to shove.

sounds fantastic!

Never follow California.

Light rail, light rail, light rail!!

Local planning and incentives will be essential to success. Provide the planning and development education and organization to energize local groups to take action, including education and entrepreneurs.

1) do not charge rural for urban issues.

2) Developers should include infrastructure as an obligation in their planning.

Run away from this proposal as fast as possible - it is simply more, bigger government control of individuals.

This absolutely insane! We are Montana not Billings-bozeman-missoula-butte-helena. Lets just legislate the relocation of the rural residents into these 5 cities.

Make individuals and companies pay their own way, instead of subsidizing their bad behavior at every turn, and they'll make decisions that make sense in a free market. We don't have to tax fuel, if we remove the subsidy that currently allows bad behavior and a failure of individuals and companies to pay their own way, instead of putting the burden on the rest of us.

Distances in Montana are too great.
Montanans need cars! Little population=little \$\$\$ for mass transit.

Great. The commuter culture is dying. Better to plan wisely than to have it forced on us by economic/environmental realities.

This will require a paradigm shift in Montana thinking.

smart growth is essentially bureaucratize for no growth. The kicker in this one is the reallocation of resources from rural areas? In other words the rural areas in Montana already provides 72% of the states tax base Lets take more away from the most needy areas and give to the large urban areas? No way!

And how about more public transportation? Also business and shopping areas are needed with good pedestrian and bicycle access - not just schools.

Some of that sounded OK but then you had to slip the tax part in at the end. Typical politicians!

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

Develop prgrams to promote higher density within cities and the city core by building up, not out.

Provide incentives for simple things like having home owners have native grass lawns that they do not water or having a very small patch of high maintenance grass.

More taxes and fees to fund the agenda of the "smart growth coalition"

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. Think housing is outrageous now?

3%-11% is too low. 20% or more would be better.

Provide incentives for people who carpool, bike, walk, or use public transportation. Public transportation should also be using biofuels or renewable energy.

Incrementalism... for what it's worth.

Double Yes! Linking land use and transportation policies is CRITICAL!

Let the free market economic analysts do this to maximize their bottom line.

Yes, we need to stop putting big stores so far from where everybody lives. If only people could walk five blocks to shop instead of driving five miles...

Require the environmental assessments of new developments to assess the degree to which their site selection and project design are energy efficient. Provide guidelines for evaluating this. Also, the existing CTAP program in the MT Dept. of Commerce should be expanded to provide adequate staffing on smart growth principles. Don't create a new CTAP program just for smart growth.

TLU-5 is a good proposal. Nore of this kind of practical measure, less 1960's "Progressive" retread plans.

This is beyond the DEQ's ability to manage.

Bad idea to mix all these programs together. For instance the smart growth principles and fast track permitting and reduction of building permit fees is a bad idea, and will meet much resistance in communities like Missoula, that already hate the concept of things like "density bonuses." Infill is not the answer. Let the local communities decide how best to proceed with zoning and planning. Give them tools that work--like putting some teeth in neighborhood plans, in relation to how zoning shakes out.

Local option fuel or sales taxes - a fine idea. The state should actively work to give municipalities & counties the ability to vote these taxes.

I would love to see more transportation networks around towns...unfortunately, that is so expensive to do in far-flung areas. But there must be a way!

Yes

No New Taxes. Period. Especially local sales taxes cleverly disguised as "save the planet" taxes.

Growth and associated issues (impact fees, transportation issues, sewage disposal issues, road provision, public school availability, loss of farmland/wetlands/open space, big box store size limits, honoring of local growth policies, etc...) are crucial in our state for many reasons. I hope that all legislation will reflect what we have to learn from other states that have not taken action and had decreased quality of life as a result. very important!!!!

Growth policies between cities and counties must be coordinated to encourage close-in development. Current lack of standards or limited management in counties (vs cities) seems to drive development away from town. Joint city-county planning departments required to truly control/guide smart growth.

Bingo! Think local. Live local. Consume local. Walk don't drive, etc. etc. -- European, urban "village" model is correct approach. Stop incenting residential development outside municipal boundaries. IC auto is destroying the earth. Time to discourage long distance commuting?

Other examples - nationwide - have illustrated how important these kinds of incentives and smart growth management/considerations are.

I thought in Montana that cities and counties had planning departments. One aspect of planning is traffic flow. Don't these departments do this now.

Absolutely! This should be one of the best tools for the long run. Impact of subdivisions should be estimated and publicized.

This is a great goal for big urban areas where population density lends itself to mass transit systems. It just doesn't work here. Count the riders on the existing bus systems. It's nearly zero per mile. There is a reason for that.

Gut shoot them at the border

Would also like to see a lowering of the speed limit to 60-65 to reduce gas consumption 10-12%

absolutely

Aj big YES to public transportation, including TRAINS, and communities less spread out and people needing to go fewer miles to work and amenities.

Would seem to require more cost than benefit.

Smart growth has proven to be very restrictive to landowners and becoming an avenue for yet more taxes to be collected.

Transit improvement in this state is essential - along with that comes good walking and biking facilities. Local option fuel and sales taxes dedicated to transit are critical for communities to be able to afford these options.

Most of these programs have proven to not be cost effective and do not achieve intended goals. Government should be funding transportation costs out of taxes they already receive. This will increase costs dramatically-there is no parking in most downtowns in Montana already. No one is riding bicycles in the middle of winter in Montana!!!

This is perhaps the most salient and needed of all the recommendations. Achieving these goals will do more than conserve energy, it will help build sustainable communities.

Support in every way possible access to high speed internet. Rural communities are being crippled economically by the unavailability and or very high prices for this vital access.

Tricky politically; need to work closely and helpfully with local gov'ts, particularly in high growth areas.

No way, if I wanted to live like the Amish, I'd move away from Montana

Some possibilities here, but basic concept of existing world is based on vehicle travel. You can't start over without removing all existing development, so the end result is that you won't save much here for many years.

Critical aspect of demand side reduction of transportation energy/emissions

What is the cost of this proposal!?!? Some of the plans sound like the old Smart Growth effort to me. If towns want public transportation, let them decide. And no impact fees!!! They negatively affect the cost of affordable housing.

SOME OF THESE IDEAS MIGHT HAVE SOME MERIT BUT ON THE WHOLE THEY ARE TOO INTRUSIVE AND RESTRICTIVE. THEY WOULD ERODE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS EVEN MORE.

We need better mass transit!

3-11% doesn't sound very significant to me. Moreover, I suspect most vehicle miles traveled in Montana are not urban, but rather are "peri-urban", ie commuting into and out of urban areas from surrounding rural residential areas. We need incentives not only to build in cities, but also to make city housing affordable compared to rural residential housing.

This may be a way to increase the availability and use of public or shared transport.

I'm tired of seeing our community resources spread paper thin all over Montana: it's time for us to focus our growth on dense areas where community resources already exist. It's safer, cheaper, and more neighborly to live in dense areas and it just makes sense.

connect bikeways, walkways, increase bus service in towns, connect buses and trains state-wide, switch many signals with _single_ lane roundabouts. encourage car pools, car share, and flexbike. more compact communities... thanks!

3% to 11% doesn't sound significant.

I like the legislative ideas

GO FOR IT !!!!

Some of these ideas are fine. Intermodal spending is stupid, just look at the Helena trolley, the only person that uses the bus regularly is the driver. Local governments should consider a local option gas tax, with a vote of the public, but impact fees to fund a transportation service that no one uses is dumb.

nobody will do it unless it's forced financially--tax the heck out of gas and subsidize mass transit

This is Montana. People don't walk here unless they are carrying a gun hunting, and they can't ride a bicycle 6-months out of the year. Public transportation will "take off" when and if it becomes cost competitive and convenient enough to use.

Most of this would be accomplished if we would just start honoring our citizens' property rights and let them develop their land as they desire.

Under Federal definition, how many urban areas are there in Montana? This is a "feel good" idea.

This is an extension of "Smart Growth" policies and, having lived in Portland, OR, I can attest this results in increased congestion, low property values, and increased air-pollution. It is the anti-thesis of improving air quality.

women waste 80% of all fuel doing nothing, in kalispell the idiots have move all most all business, shops, doctors,dentists out of town. all most nothing is with in walking distance.

"Reallocation of funding from rural areas" is a scarey prospect. Sounds more like "making country folks pay for city folks' problems".

Growth and development measures crucial due to collatoral effects of growth

Local option taxes are critical if Montana's cities are to remain livable in the next few decades.

These are local issues and should be worked out there, the local option tax should be a fuel tax but it must be county wide or it peanalizes the in city fuel providers, every one would have to drive to the county to get gas.

This is smart planning.

I would love to see a light rail system in Missoula and would be willing to pay to see it come to fruition. Montana needs a public transportation system in and between the cities. Can we get a train that runs from Yellowstone to GNP through all the cites??

See www.redevelopment.com for an example of what "Smart" growth does to (not FOR, but TO) the people. Smart Growth is an Agenda 21 item. Perhaps the populace needs to be educated on Agenda 21.

This is complete nonsense in a rural state like Montana!

This is so scary. It sounds like communism, socialism all wraped up in one package. We will truly not be free any more. Capitalism will be dead, so will the lives of Montanans. God help us all. We need to get a new Governor he truly does not represent freedom and liberty.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. No new taxes. Montana's poor and middle class cannot pay any more for energy.

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

unobtainable

NO MORE TAXES. MONTANA CITIZENS PAY ENOUGH ALREADY!

Doesn't work. If it did, there would still be small grocery stores in neighborhoods. This is not how people really live, nor how they want to live in the future.

Understanding that there must be planning in growth across Montana, reallocation of funding from rural areas will impact the ability to exercise property rights of rural Montanans.

Smart growth equates to no growth!

Local option fuel or sales taxes or developer impact fees will cost the consumer and local citizens and will be nothing more than a penalty for living in Montana.

Another tax plan, "Local option fuel tax" to get people in urban areas to ride the bus. I rode the bus for two weeks to work once, it took over an hour to go 15 minutes. at the current min. wage that means that the consumer will spend 10.00 per day to travel 30 min to work and back arrive either late or way ahead of time, leave early and stand around unproductive until the bus arrives, Did any one on the committee ever ride a bus to work.

Regulation to determine where i can buy and build in montana. Not a good Idea.

Good Idea! Hit the rural areas. Take a number, everyone else is getting their licks in. Fast track permitting, AGAIN, use building codes and DEQ permits to legislate/mandate and kill of anything other than what you want.

Again too much government control and Big Brother tactics.

Most good except for requirements on where public buildings MUST be located. This is not always going to be possible or feasible, but should rather be offered as a guideline or preference.

Perhaps we should all just sit around and wait until the government tells us where we can live and how we can transport ourselves. This is nuts.

A lot of bike and pedestrian opportunities that are low cost are lost due to bad planning--I have 2 specific old bridges in mind.

Though I'm in full support of the Growth and Development Bundle, I do not want a sales tax in Montana. Although the middle column, and therefore the idea of a sales tax, is merely hypothetical, it is important enough even in its hypothetical state to provoke a comment.

Current state policies on water well permitting and other state level infrastructure decisions are counter productive. Permitting for municipal grade investments are difficult but small individual systems with similar collective impact receive minimal review. All state road system projects should include pedestrian and bicycle components with emphasis on connecting networks so safe travel point to point can be achieved.

all of this sounds expensive and my opinion would be based on the costs

I agree with all of these recommendations except the local option fuel tax. Option on necessary goods drive people outside of the tax area to purchase them. Not only hurting those businesses in the district but wasting more energy to purchase outside the tax district.

Again this all comes with a cost. Many of these recommendations are already being done where possible. Probably the biggest deterrent is ill thought regulations themselves. Water laws that require high costs for developments, etc.

Do more quicker

I agree with all of these recommendations except the local option fuel tax. Option on necessary goods drive people outside of the tax area to purchase them. Not only hurting those business in the district but wasting more energy to purchase outside the tax district.

This is most important; manage growth to mandate Focus Inwards on urban areas. This is very important for the future health and viability of our urban areas.

that a good idea steel from the rural areas to polish the cities. keep rural areas poor to subsidise the cities. nononononononono..... Golly gee I hope we can get you socialists out of office. Whatever happened to freedom.

some one pipe dream? Did someone not look at the map? We don't all live in Missoula.

Seems like more beauracracy. Probably result in higher taxes to everyone with little benefit to climate change.

It's a great idea, if its possible...and economically feasible. You've got a number of things mixed into this and I'm not sure that I support all of them.

Why don't you all move to Cuba, I think all these rules have already been implemented and just look at their economy.

Much of this is already in state law.

Tax Tax Tax

This can only happen with support from realtors. They must have the long view: that livability increases with smart growth instead of letting developers profit at the expense of the commons.

Can't dump rural communities.

I support this in theory, but parts of it are bothersome. In fill development results in groundwater issues. Montanans like their space around them, so this would be a hardsell to most of us.

Infrastructure improvement is needed and beneficial, but I don't see this gaining us much in the end for the pricetag.

Make cities way more bike/pedestrian friendly. SLOW down traffic, change 4 lane city roads to 3 lanes (middle turn lanes), use roundabouts instead of traffic lights. More you accommodate the fast moving traffic the more traffic you have and the faster the cars move, making it unsafe for bikes/pedestrian.

"Establish a state-level Community Technical Assistance Program on smart growth." This sounds the most constructive.

Electric Trolley systems are easy to maintain, control and asthetic; they add a touch of class wherever you see them, and are always fun to ride. Missoula is a prime candidate with a natural run through downtown via Broadway, out to Reserve to Higgins then back down to Broadway.

I would like to see a greater focus on building bike lanes and trails as well as increasing awareness that drivers need to share the road with cyclists.

if done right it would be great.

This will cost taxpayers much more than will be gained. And why are we going to hurt rural Montana even more? Rural MT is already on life support, and you want to take more away from them?

Growth -- smart or otherwise -- will face limits imposed by climate-driven drought from snow loss, hot summers, etc. There will be no "smart" in growth that does not recognize, accept, and set policy in accordance with limits imposed by a plausible shrinkage of available water.

raise taxes for fantasy land can't pay for upkeep of roads and bridges now.

Esp. in rural areas where there are no options

No! There's nothing smart about "smart growth".

Oh Come on!! We don't all live in big cities! This is MONTANA for goodness sakes!

This is extremely important: move business back into town. Most cities in Montana have become impossible to live in without a car. This defeats the purpose of a city. Public Use Bicycles, business incentives, making box stores maintain the roads that lead to them; all are important measures. Discover more of them.

Suburban sprawl is responsible for the huge jump in vehicle miles traveled out of proportion to population growth.

This concept is naive. Montana is rural state with no infrastructure to provide mass transportation.

My one problem with 'infill' is it creates crowded conditions conducive to crime, and obscuring views of open spaces. A limit of 2-3 story buildings allows everyone to have a view of the mountains, and obscuring that would ruin the Montana living experience. I wholeheartedly support more public transportation. I am in the process of bringing a 200 person conference to Montana in 2010 and find that there is no bus transportation for people to explore the city - go to some of the great restaurants. We're leaning toward a hotel with microwaves and refrigerators in one city, because there is a market within walking distance of the hotel. There is a bus, but it stops running at 6:30pm and doesn't run on weekends, so people can't go out to dinner.

How about building more refineries, power plants, and mining/drilling for more fuel? Reduce the power cost and attract business. Economic and population growth need MORE power, not less. No rationing.

"Smart growth" is, in practice, a code word for depriving individuals the freedom to use and develop their land as they please. This is not what Montanans want!

I support most of this plan with the exception of local fuel or sales tax, or developer impact fees

I support pre-planning efforts for all development that occurs. Let's think things through and determine the best way to develop before we just start building.

Sounds too expensive for what it will achieve.

This proposal has a huge price tag on it. Again, I don't believe there is sufficient sound science on GW to justify this.

this should include public transportation

Promoting compact development is key to reducing miles driven and improving the quality of urban living. Density also drives the feasibility and level of convenience of public transportation.

Reduction of urban sprawl is good in many ways, especially for habitat protection.

Yes Yes Yes! How about light rail, and more public transportation.

This proposal would not be fiscally feasible in Eastern Montana. One size does not fit all communities in Montana.

Tax individual drivers that are commuting to work by just themselves and encourage car pooling by strong tax incentives and monitored by the local and state law enforcement personnel.

Sound great but difficult to force people to do all these things.

Let's take monies away from rural roads, and make them even more dangerous, to accomidate the city folks. Cities for the most part now have public transportation of some sort with the State already trying to educate the use thereof. And did I mention More taxes!

Great, progressive ideas!

Rural areas should not fund urban development. Montana is mostly rural. That's what makes this State so great. If I wanted to pay for urban development I would move to California!

Our fuel taxes are already high in Montana. And we do not need impact fees. If towns see a need for public transportation, they can figure it out, but the state does not need to become involved.

YES!

Programs are in place, just not used effectively by cities and towns. Helena has no established bus routes, yet has a municipal bus fleet that will go door to door? How stupid is that? Pushing for a bike path along the BNSF RR line from Helena to Great Falls, why not a light rail system between the towns? What happened to Amtrak along the southern route in MT?

Should allow free market development for maximum efficiency.

How about some mass transit options in more populated areas too!

I like the idea of encouraging people to live near where they work and provide mass-transit, but not at the cost of extra taxes.

Don't you think we've reallocated enough funding from rural areas?

No!No!No! We can't do this in most of the state. Perhaps you should try if out in Helena first. See how you like it.

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

Some low-cost and ready to use tools here.

For 99% of Montana, this would not hardly even apply. Again, too much government control, and way too costly.

The missing link in Montana.

This addresses both Montana's growth problems and its GHG emission issues.

The number of miles a citizen places on his automobile is his or own business. The more I read of this questionair the more I am convinced that the government of the State of Montana is trying to get the people of Montan to accept a communistic form of government. No thank you!

We already have this-all this would do is establish another state agency to be supported by tax money. A waste of time and money.

light rail and other train-based intercity transport, especially along existing tracks. Bitterroot to Whitefish, I-90 corridor, etc.

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.

too many unknowns.Can state government mandate to local governments??????

Sprawling malls should be required to provide effective bus service to the city centers they are sucking dry.

Unnecessary

Manage and direct. Taxes... Developer...Establish state-level...Expand....now I have a real clear idea.

NO MORE REGULATIONS PLEASE!

We already have enough taxes, we don't need to add a local level sales tax!

this is mt not cal.

Is a policy based on urban mileage realistic in MT?

greatly reducing urban sprawl ought to be a primary goal in promoting more efficient travel as well as more efficinet development of infrastructure.

re-introduce commuter trains.

this stinks like another feeble attempt to get a sales tax shoved down our throats.

Rural communities have enough economic problems now. Rural communities could not benefit from this in the same aspects as the large communities could (utilizing metra bus systems, etc.). This should be a metro-area concern, not a rural concern.

Great ideas!

Too much money will be spent on studies.

Very important combinations of goals and actions

As Missoula resident, I'd like to see us become a model for how a small city can grow without more and more roads taking up all our dollars....really worth supporting the change from 'business as usual', meaning more cars.

Excellent!

If you want to work for the state-you ride the bicycle to work-simple. C'mon people-we've got 10 years, maybe-before the fossil fuels go to \$1000/barrel-and begin to disappear-where have you been?

na

Put in a train in every town that travels the main routes and new bike paths.

too many points to say I agree or disagree to all

I don't see how this would be effective in Montana at this time.

This might work in cities, but most of Montana is rural and would be impossible.

In fill development is an excellent idea that should be promoted.

EXCELLENT, EXCELLENT, EXCELLENT !!!!! This should have a huge impact, and will give people a chance to contribute to solving the problem in a meaningful way. The word will get around the community, and people will feel empowered and proud of what they're doing.

Do you even have a clue about the physical characteristics of our state? We don't have any urban areas. No, Billings isn't even close. Spend some time inside the I-294 & then come appreciate what we do have. Oh, and taking away from the rural areas is wrong. We try to keep these areas alive & measures like this will kill them.

Smart development and redevelopment is crucial in getting away from our dependency on cars.

unconstitutional mostly bad ideas. smart growth is stupid , only local control will fix local problems.

what happened to freedom to travel? smart growth by corrupt control freaks.

This is not feasible in Eastern Montana. Some thought needs to be put into what works for everyone, not just some areas of the state!!!

To reallocate resources from rural areas to help implement smart growth policies in cities would be view as a "taking". How much more would new taxes and fees be?

Relocating funding is the same as stealing. Why don't you just say steal funding like you do now.

Effective public transportation in all of the larger cities is key, but it is unlikely that will ever be able to eliminate need for use of private vehicles in this large state.

"Smart Growth" is someone else planning MY future on MY LAND. It may seem smart to planners, but it is not smart for ME, and I respect and treasure my property rights.

Go for 11% or better. Try for 20%.

Make it easier in Montana to stay out of your car.

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

Sieg Heil.

Yawn

Wouldn't work in Eastern Montana--we're too far apart and busy with our own travel needs. Counties out here couldn't afford the mandates suggested above and besides, counties don't have the staff.

More big brother craziness Montana cannot afford.

The market provides its own incentives! This is all beginning to be accomplished on a voluntary basis; which is the best possible way to continue it most efficiently and successfully.

Education and trust not regulate and tax

Nice to see a range of numbers! Respect private property rights.

GET THE TRAINS BACK IN SERVICE WHERE EVER FEASIBLE IN MONTANA- AMTRAK AND BURLINGTON NORTHERN both INCENTIVIZED TO MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE RAIL SERVICES

Urban? Come on - take a trip around Montana please. Urban areas comprise a low percentage of the state's area.

What works in Missoula sure won't be the same in rural areas.

drive no more than 65, or Steve Running says the planet's a goner, if we are not willing to do something this trivial, that won't cost a cent, and in fact, will save money.

Sounds good but needs a lot of thought. We need transportation from small towns all across Montana. If you do not have a dependable car or do not drive, in many areas of the state, you just do not go anywhere. We need a good bus network.

tax the rural folk to pay for city buses?

Where does the state fuel tax paid for gas and diesel go now?

I DO NOT support a sales tax in Montana. There are enough taxes already-- where these are going should simply be re-allocated. Our country is NOT Europe, where I have lived. Our country was built around the fact that we have room here. Mass transportation is good, but only when an area is already built for that. The idea to implement this here, in the Bik Sky Country of Montana, is simply ludicrous. Billings is big enough for a good bus system. But nothing more. And what already exists in the other cities of this state is enough.

All long overdue

In addition to the above, implement a "cost to society" evaluation to all proposed out-of-town subdivisions with respect to an estimated yearly transportation fuel consumption and its effect on the economics of the community.

smart growth is crucial!

YUP---LETS INSTALL UNDER STREET HEATING SYSTEMS TO KEEP ICE AND SNOW OFF OF ROADWAYS SOS WE CAN RIDE OUR BIKES TO WORK AND HOME---

Don't like the fast-track permitting or reduction of building permit fees as incentives.

Do not feel qualified to evaluate most of these potential legislative remedies, but I do believe we should make a greater effort at local/state government cooperation and collaboration on smart growth principles.

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

not necessary absolutely not local option taxes unless general statewide sales tax with appropriate reduction in property and income tax

Agree with all except the local tax option. Such taxes often drive people outside the tax area for goods and services.

This smacks of command and control. Our state DOT is working on some of this already - bring them to the table for good ideas instead of blindly passing mandates.

I watch buses in communities in Montana run around empty. They burn fuel and carry no passengers. I don't know how you intend to legislate that people use public transportation

There are so many things wrong with this proposal that I do not know where to begin. There is no shortage of land to have as open space and to develop in this state. We choose to live in Montana so that we can have larger lot's and more space between houses, not so that we can live in multi-level condos stuck downtown for infill. Permitting a new development is already difficult, this would make it more so. Limiting land available for development adds costs to housing. It is estimated that a similar "in fill only" regulation in Seattle added as much as \$200,000 to the price of each house. (AP article) Public transportation has been tried, subsidized, subsidized more and still failed. Buses simply don't work in Dutton!!! We are a rural state - we truly have no cities. Local option taxes have been defeated at the legislature for years. Adding a new use to them will not make them any prettier. This is a back door attempt to force into law the policies that the Smart Growth coalition has

I feel that this is a very important issue for Montana. Implementing growth and development policies that encourage densification and diversification as well as use of alternative modes of transportation could have a large impact on GHG emissions and would have a cadre of other environmental, economic, and social benefits.

Strongly support

yes!

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

Do not agree with establishment of state level program.

With our distributed population, this is a farce. Can tell the consultants pulled the wool over our eyes on this one.

Big focus on bicycle, pedestrian and public transport.

Too broad a question.

no sales tax

Develop bus or short-line train transportation for rural commuters.

growth policy should support, not mandate

In town transportation could be more efficient. But the long distances that rural folks have to travel won't change their driving patterns. If state offices are located in downtown areas, how do you get your truck and horse trailer in there to go see USDA?

very important

Our rural area is attempting to provide a multimodal transportation system in this small valley and would not want to lose funding potential to towns. We have to drive distances, can't bike, ride horses, run as it isn't safe presently.

This area will have high GHG growth over the coming decade. It is incredibly important for the state to begin a guiding policy that can help lead to smart growth and an overall reduction of VMT. If CCAC wants a goal at the higher end of 3%-11%, then just increase 3% to 6%

The goals in this area should be stronger. The growth of emissions over the next decade is very high in this area and there are important quality of life considerations to reducing the amount of time people must spend driving.

Huge undertaking, but worthwhile in the long run.

As petroleum production wanes need mass-transit transportation alternatives including passenger rail.