

TLU-7 Comments
Recommendation 32
Heavy-duty vehicle emissions standards and retrofit incentives

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.
Cost benefit analysis must be completed.

diesel engines are bad because you can see the exhaust...add emissions controls and reduce the economy of the engine by 40%. Burning more fuel to do the same amount of work is hardly environmentally friendly.

Almost all of the heavy duty trucks on our Interstate Highways are based out of Montana. This would not help at all for those trucks.

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.

who will pay for all this,

Montana should not be doing these things on its own.

Tax credits are an inefficient way to effect social policy change. I would prefer low interest loans or subsidized technology.

How much will it cost to retrofit 50% of the pre-2007 diesel fleet?

biodiesel

Lead by example and education on health benefits to employees and the public.

tightening diesel standards is long overdue - the technology is here

I have no desire to pay for this.

Are the tax credits net gain or net loss for the business owner? How are you going legislate the agriculture of our state?

Remove the subsidies that encourage bad behavior and damage to public health. Let the market do its job. If they can no longer afford to be bad kids, once the subsidies are removed, they'll change their behavior.

Let's see what happens? It's a place to start.

Incentives and voluntary - perfect- and I don't even own a heavy duty vehicle.

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

What is the cost of an individual diesel retrofit? If the costs are to be born by offsetting tax credits, how much reduction in tax revenue will this amount to?

The construction and mining industry has hundreds of millions of dollars invested in heavy duty diesel vehicles. 50% of pre 2007 heavy duty diesel engines is an impossible goal.
Biggest concern: will the retrofit increase the efficiency of the vehicles? What is the cost-benefit analysis?

Another good idea. Focus on rewarding industry and individuals for modernizing physical plant.

Voluntary programs for out of state truckers plus education? Hahahaha. Here have a brochure with your donut and coffee at the truck stop. hahahaha. Tax credits for Montana-based truckers and construction companies, yes. Save the education money for credits.

I don't trust public education programs when eco-groups are involved. The facts tend to get buried under ideology.

retrofits should be mandatory.

Diesel engines trucks and cars should be illegal. Gasoline engine cars and trucks should be next. It's time for change. End of story.

could be a good idea.

Retrofit only makes sense on certain vehicles cost wise. It makes no economic sense to retrofit a 12 year old truck that is at the end of its service life.

maybe voluntary for some period and then mandatory?

Yes. Easiest would be to address new sales.

How are you going to regulate this in Interstate Commerce which is where these vehicles operate?

Aha! Heavy trucks addressed. Thanks!

Tough on farmers.

Clean burning diesel engines are already available in Europe-we could be using here now.
lets socialize the driving monkeys

We (MT) are not a large enough market to wag this dog. California will make it happen and all we have to do is finance the changes.

As a bicyclist, I hate diesel vehicles. They are just simply nasty. Except for major commercial use, I cannot see how they are even allowed the way they are now for cars and pickups.

This could foster economic development as these vehicles are retrofitted. Payback for industry just a few years.

If incentives are provided this is a good idea.

This is already happening. It will take longer than you want, but you can't speed it up much either.

Costs of retrofiting can be high. Tax credits are well and good (what is the cost), but the initial cost can be prohibitive, depending on the each individual case.

AS LONG AS ITS VOLUNTARY AND MARKET BASED. TAXES AND PUNITIVE FEES ARE NOT MARKET BASED INCENTIVES.

And reduce the noise emissions, too! And convince diesel drivers that they don't have to idle their engines; they can just shut them off when they're not moving.

No tax credits - education OK

If you want to drive a big truck and produce more emissions, it will cost more.

Reduce noise emissions too! Diesel drivers don't have to idle their engines any more.

Absolutely!

Will this cause companies to operate outside of Montana?

Will have very little impact on improving air quality.

Why are these vehicle not help to emission standards?

It is fine to have the State reduce their emissions, but please let the private sector do what is best for the overall economy of Montana.

"Retrofit" is a misnomer. This will cost a significant amount of money. Additionally, Diesel is well known to be a dirtier running engine than gasoline.

who would the information be coming from?

Voluntary is good. Credits are good.

Again, dismantling or scrapping programs only result in a net increase in emissions through the production of new vehicles. Allowing the existing fleet to be retired as necessary is the smart solution.

Sounds ok but how are we going to pay for this?

Why can't the state of Montana use only hybrids and convert all diesels to run on vegetable oil?

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.

not a cost effective option.

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

How voluntary is this proposal? Diesel owners are already paying 30-50 cents per gallon more than gasoline users. This is taxing diesel owner already, diesel is a by-product of manufacturing gasoline, so historically diesel was 20-30 cents cheaper. Gas companies way of disposing of the waste.

Providing a source of information and benefits of retrofit is noble. Most of Montana is not geographically feasible to retrofit most engines, due to the loss of power in these engines. Agriculture would be good example.

Another Incentive Program--do you suppose the Tax payer should have a say in how you plan to spend there money

The market will do this with the high cost of diesel

A program of this type must not injure our trucking commerce industry. We must not pay higher prices to have goods delivered to us. We cannot afford higher prices.

A lot of emission controls are halving the life of diesel engines so we are until this problem is fixed not going to get a net gain here except to engine manufacturers and mechanics (like my son)

Is there any sort of timeline in mind for these retrofits? A deadline of sorts may encourage more immediate action, and is something to think about.

education is always good and voluntary is the key word in this portion of the program.

Would agree that Montana should work with other groups for on road heavy duty vehicles and provide incentives for retrofits. Funding for these retrofits should come from general sources and not highway construction funds.

These retrofits are expensive, and relatively ineffective.

Would agree that Montana should work with other groups for on road heavy duty vehicles and provide incentives for retrofits. Funding for these retrofits should come from general sources and not highway construction funds.

This is more like what needs to happen. Power by the sword has never worked and won't now. Be proactive rather than control-motivated.

If this was done on a voluntary basis with incentives, it would be better. I don't like mandatory retrofit of diesel engines. Will increase the cost to Montana's agricultural community with little benefit to climate change.

This will adversely affect our ag industry.

I hate diesel....too smelly. it makes you feel like you live in a polluted place.

Diesel as it exists is disproportionately polluting. Enforcement with teeth needed for railroads and older vehicles. Is there a way to enforce a cap on idling of diesels?

Don't encourage driving though...

Clean them up there going to be around a while.

again, how much CO2 does a chord of wood put out with an old wood stove?

Wasn't hemp oil (from renewable plant) first intended to operate diesel engines? We need to use it today.

tax breaks for the rich raise taxes for the poor

Mandatory plus it stinks. This should also be so on trains etc.

Retro-fitting is a great way to go, there are far more older trucks in existence than will be purchased in the few upcoming years.

Let's not subsidize trucks over trains even more.

Time and the private sector will take care of this if needed.

I would support such a program if it is voluntary and does not burden vehicle owners with state imposed vehicle emission requirements or penalties for failing to meet state emissions

yes! lead by example by retrofitting state fleets! Feds should do this too!
Tax credits and voluntary programs are the way to go.

Cost to the taxpayers??

Would likely need highly compelling incentives to make this desirable.

Most diesel users are feeling the "bite" of the cost of diesel now. They are all looking for better ways to improve their fuel use now.

Yes, I totally agree. That should be done.

One of the reasons farmers/ranchers depend on heavy duty diesel vehicles is because they need the power to pull stock trailers or other heavily loaded trailers. Any retrofit that would reduce that power that is needed should not be expected to be supported.

Establish a non-voluntary retrofit program. Also create a vehicle check station that will monitor the environmental threats emitting from leaky gas tanks, leaky oil pans etc. along with general safety equipment like front and rear lighting as well as the current insurance requirements. If after a failed check if things are not corrected then revoke drivers license and impound the vehicle.

If reasonable to do. It makes sense with tax credits.

This is one place I don't like to compromise much. I think diesel should be a fuel type that doesn't get the voluntary choice but is required to change and adapt. I think this needs to be more stringent than it is in the requirements if possible.

Economically unfeasible.

No tax credits: requirements instead. Costs of pollution shouldn't be externalized. Truckers should pay real costs & pass them along to consumers, who then can see true costs of buying stuff that's shipped long distances.

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.

Let's not kill the already suffering and disappearing middle class in this country with added bills.

This will be inflationary, it will drive up the costs of goods and services of every business, every household and every person in the state.

Incentives are acceptable. Programs should be voluntary and will not support mandatory programs, guidelines or limits

Diesel may stink, but it isn't any more toxic than any other gas. Again, too costly. Who is going to pay for all this?

We are beyond the point where we should be investing heavily in voluntary programs. However, state owned fleets should be retrofitted or replaced as soon as possible.

Here again ... we hear the word taxes; only now it is used as a threat.

This is not needed-the life of a truck is so short, most trucks will be replaced with the "higher standard" engines before this can take effect.

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.

Encourage, Tax credits,, information----all are positive

More accounting niissance

Tax credits. Voluntary? Another attempt at mandatory brain washing subsidized by taxes.

I have never seen a point where education was a bad thing.

The big-truck traffic will only GROW, as we foolishly discard our railroads, so we need to do this NOW

Unrealistic expectation!

GM ALREADY ON THERE 2008 DEISELS ALREADY MEET THE EMMISSON STD

Who bears the inherent costs?

are you going to pay for the retrofit of my diesel engine or just make me pay this too?

All of these recommendations are presented as 'equal' -- I've heard that proper tire inflation is a huge gas saver....is that true for retrofitting diesel engine? Really hard to estimate the relative value of each of these, in relation to relative cost? Of course, haven't read the report, but are there some criteria you used to come up with these; some minimum ratio of benefit to cost?

Encourage? "They" do it-or else!!

good idea.

"Lead by example...." Very important, excellent idea.How about doing that with the vehicles of the Police and Sheriff's Departments, as is done in quite a few communities across the country!

This may be the stupidest recommendation yet.

There is better technology out there. this is stupid as long as diesel engines are able to run on vegetable oil.

Heavy duty vehicle efficiency could be improved now by enforcement of truck speed limits and requiring trucks to turn off their engines when parked.

Is there any thought given to the farmer/rancher population of Montana? Heavy duty diesel vehicles are needed for their livelihood and such a proposal reduces the power of the engines plus adds just another expense.

Heavy duty diesel trucks play an important role in Montana's mining, agriculture and construction industries. Has the cost to retrofit 50% of pre-2007 engines been calculated?

The key word here may be voluntary

As long as it is voluntary

How can this be accomplished by 2006 and 2007. But I really feel these need to be done.

Incentives are acceptable. Programs should be voluntary and will not support mandatory programs, guidelines or limits

Come on. This has NOTHING to do with carbon emissions or even total energy use. In fact, there is an energy PENALTY for all this. Plus the fact remains that diesel pollution is not significant on a statewide level.

retrofitting is expensive, often costing more than the vehicle or equipment is worth.

Something needs to aim at efficiency of privately owned pick-up trucks and large SUVs.

I'm a farmer/rancher. One of the reasons we use diesel pickups is for the power we need when pulling heavily loaded trailers. I am concerned that a retrofit would reduce the power I need.

Yes, tax credits

The costs of doing such do not provide a comparable return.

"Encourage" and "Lead" imply cooperation, rather than coercion;-)

limit speeds to 65

Just be careful you do not make it impossible for farmers and small business people to carry on their business without going broke.

enough of the heavy equipment getting away with killer pollution levels

with fuel costs already over \$3.50 a gallon, tires averaging over \$300, shop labor running close to \$100 an hour how many truckers do you think can afford a retrofit? The big companies will just pass the cost on to you the consumer for food, clothing, and anything delivered by truck. There goes the little guy again.

What would the financial incentives be to companies? Retrofits are not cheap.

AFTERBURNERS??? EMISSION CONTROLS ALREADY DEVELOPED AND TRIED "DON'T WORK"---HOW ABOUT LOWER SULPHUR FUELS TO BURN UP THE EXISTING FLEET SOONER!!!

Only the tax incentive will work - or a requirement.

We're filling the state coffers with energy tax returns. Take some of the profits and give it back if people are willing to do their part and retrofit their trucks.

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

Need more than voluntary. This is a weak looking program.

Totally unattainable and expense to general public would be prohibitive.

This is already being done with the Rocky Mountain Clean Diesel Collaborative (US EPA and western states) but Montana needs to ensure we get our share of the Federal funds that are available and then develop state programs for retrofit and replacement.

My taxes pay to change over all the state vehicles (instead of allowing for attrition to make the change) - the little trucking companies are saddled with an additional expense -- and the large companies that run so many miles that they regularly change out their engines anyway, get a tax credit to do what they were going to do in the first place. This doesn't sound cheap.

Cost effectiveness at this stage a problem. Lower priority.

Encourage, do not mandate.

Retrofitting is going to be very cost prohibitive

At present we do not have a specific position on this. But we agree that any approach should be voluntary.

Start with state vehicles. lead by example.