

AFW-2 Comments
Recommendation 40
Biodiesel production (incentives for feedstocks and production plants)

economics should take care of this itself

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

don't use feed to make fuel.....think about that for a minute.

need to encourage collectives and cooperatives

And, make it easier to manufacture biodiesel. The current requirements are often intimidating.

WE need a better analysis of the price impact on food before we go down this path.

It does not work in cold climates unless you add back in very expensive additives. 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.

Whose needs will be met and where's the money coming from?

Absolutely. Inform public of camelina properties and how it can be used for "waste" land.

Such incentive programs should be conducted at the federal level.

I wonder whether it wise or economical to expand energy production by using plants that would otherwise be eaten or support another part of food production.

These targets are far too low. Should be 10%; 20% and 50%.

If this means converting food crops to fuel, I don't support it.

Encourage RailLink to utilize biodiesel, study other state railroad success in this area

Keep it local, uncentralized so small farmers have a chance at being able to stay in their communities. Large incentives for corporations elbows out the little guy. We want more farmers.

I am still learning about this complicated issue. Camelina does sound a lot more promising than many other biofuels.

To include Algae farming.

Farmers/ranchers will move to this if the market supports it.

How will this impact the prices of these commodities worldwide?

Let the market decide if it's a good idea to have more biodiesel. Remove the subsidies and see what the market produces.

Don't burn our food supply!

Not until biodiesel production is shown to have a significantly smaller ecological footprint.

Foodstocks into diesel I don't support.

This is not possible in today's market. We shouldn't mislead folks into thinking it is anywhere near a reasonable cost. At double figure wheat prices, no-one is going to grow cheap oilseed such as camelina or canola.

Local is best, local fuel, local jobs. Growing seed crops and building new Biodiesel production facilities can be great for our economy. I want the option to buy locally produced fuel, and I want to see the city services and bus fleets using it!

Biofuel is not economically feasible at this point. Ethanol only if you have crops at a reasonable cost. sf

Biofuel is a bad joke on people who lack fourth grade arithmetic skills. Substitution will not substitute for conservation.

I doubt that biodiesel is the right solution to our energy needs.

Biodiesel does not make sense as a long-term solution, given the low energy output, and the impact it has on availability of food.

Montana is in an excellent position (climate and soils) to capitalize on this.

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

Do we even have the farm acreage and production capability to meet these goals?

Reduce exports first.

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.

Biodiesel is great only if it is from used cooking oil. If we just produce oil from plants and not after it has been used for cooking, the energy that is created barely meets what took to create it.

Biodiesel is more of a racket for Big Ag than it is a solution to our oil addiction, especially where it uses food stocks, raising prices.

Depends on the biodiesel. Are we talking switchgrass? Then I say "5". Are we talking corn? Then "1"

Corn biodiesel requires too many input units of energy. Pursue switchgrass/hemp.

The carbon footprint will increase because you will be taking green zones (forest and marginal grazing) out of regenerating Oxygen. Corn fields only provide this for 3 months.

Biofuel development raises the cost of corn and impacts the environment in a very negative way during production.

I support this provided that the total cycle of production and consumption is assessed.

Not sure how much energy is required to produce biodiesel?

NOT CORN. It is inefficient.

Provide incentives for used oil collectors.

Food crops should be used for food.

Biodiesel should not come from food crops!

I don't believe in using our food growing resources to make additional fuel. We need food more than we need additional fuel.

Recent studies are showing more and more that the total life cycle of producing many biofuels don't significantly reduce overall GHG emissions compared to their fossil fuel counterparts. See the Feb 8th issue of Science Magazine (sciencemag.org) This and other scientific evidence must be considered before any legislation is passed that inadvertently causes more harm than good.

Will biodiesel use more water, that we don't have in sufficient quantities in some communities?

Studies are now showing that biodiesel fuels also pollute very badly.

These goals are very likely not realistic. Food costs are already being impacted severely by the ethanol joke (more acreage being destroyed for farming, and 30% lower fuel economy).

Does this also include production of methane gas from cow poop?

Also need to reduce barriers to small scale production

Biodiesel should only be produced from waste material, not newly grown inputs.

Only if it is cellulosic

Be careful not to create so much demand that the price of feedstocks goes out of sight

If production could be decentralized, locally owned and controlled (ag co-ops?), it would be far better than large scale operations controlled by multi-national corporations.

Bio-diesel equal bio-stupid. As a transition technology or means of utilizing commercial (e.g. "Burger King") waste it's OK -- but agricultural production of fuel oils should not be encouraged. Fossil fuel is fossil fuel. The future does not belong to fossil fuel. Use bio-fuels/oils only as a transitional technology to eliminate imported oil - i.e. to stop sending \$1Trillion per year to enemies of the U.S.

Recent studies have concluded that biodiesel production may sound better than it really is. If food/growth production for biodiesel products reduces food supplies, this may be offset but an increase in deforestation and reduction in other carbon-sequestering crops. Also, there is some research in utilizing more native vegetation/grasses that should be researched/considered in this area of the proposal.

ONLY if the biodiesel development takes place largely within the state of Montana, and much of the consumption takes place here as well. I DO NOT support further exporting of MTs products and resources to other regions! We need to focus on developing practices, industry, and products which cycle money BACK into MT, rather than perpetually shipping bulk commodities out!

AND, ONLY in support of biodiesel crop production increases IF we maintain an equivalent focus and financial support for state-grown, produced, and consumed EDIBLE agricultural crops/livestock, etc.

I don't know that I'm buying into the whole biodiesel thing now - it is increasing the cost of food production and food products. If we're going to increase biodiesel, we should be doing it with things like switchgrass and weeds, not barley and corn. Further, maybe restaurants should be required to use their oil waste in biodiesel programs, or pay fees for disposal of waste that is usable for biodiesel programs. This question should not even make your list if you are at all aware of the problems involved in using agricultural products in the future to produce bio-diesel or ethanol. Where have you been? Read any of the latest papers on this.

stipulate that crops must not be counter productive to food prices for humans and animals

If it is camelina or some other low impact crop, yes. Other crops, like corn or sugar cane, no.

depends if it is ethanol or not. And depends what lands are being utilized for production

I don't think this can be a major petroleum replacement source. Overall impacts on environment and food supply make this a risky endeavor, except on a small scale.

not sure biodiesel actually decreases GHG emissions in the long run

The body of environmental evidence seems to be pointing toward some serious questions regarding the impact of biodiesel and ethanol production and mandates when considering the total environmental picture.

Biofuels should be developed only if they are cost effective and don't increase food costs.

Reusing plant-based oils makes much more sense, but my primary concern is, again, are we really saving much fuel by making bio-fuels? LOTS of energy used in production.

more research needed - food production should not go to fuel

Pay at the pump or pay at the grocer. Better to pay at the pump.

tricky area...must look holistically at all impacts, both fiscal and environmental on this source for energy. the trade-offs can be extremely harmful and detrimental!!!

Again, growing more fuel means growing less food.

It should be seriously encouraged to plant the appropriate crop for the appropriate use, ie switchgrass for fuel and corn for livestock.

be very careful here-there are lots of problems with total energy balance of specific production biofuels and bringing new or old marginal farm ground into production

Biodiesel is not cost effective and is inefficient. Why don't we drill more oil-gas wells?

Start reading!!! It is not what it is cracked up to be. Let's promote conservation in conjunction with biodiesel use before any support is given. More savings.

Leave bio-diesel to private industry. if it pays, it will move forward as a viable source of energy

Economic Development for Ag sector.

The only thing that biodiesel has accomplished is to increase the price of all foods. It requires more energy to produce than it creates, produces less energy per gallon than gasoline, and provides a taxpayer paid subsidy to those who should not be getting such.

Any fuel made from grains is not energy efficient. The theoretical gain in calories produces versus calories consumed is rarely even 5%. Spend your efforts elsewhere.

This is the best option at present for farmers and ranchers to grow their own fuel in a cost effective and CO2 neutral method. Grow oilseed crops, refine to biodiesel, run biodiesel in equipment-renewable and efficient. No reliance on middle east or Exxon.

Emphasis should be on small-scale community operations to maximize economic and environmental benefits, including having animal feed as a byproduct of production.

No mandated targets. Incentive only.

NOT SURE ABOUT THIS TECHNOLOGY. HAVE HEARD THAT COSTS MORE ENERGY TO PRODUCE THAN IS SAVED.

Converting native land into cropland for any use releases huge quantities of carbon into air and nitrogen into water. Studies are conflicting, but many conclude that the energy inputs for producing biodiesel exceed the amount of energy produced. We have very limited water in Montana; let's prioritize its use for human drinking and sanitation, ecosystem maintenance, food crop production, and last priority for industry, including biodiesel production.

Biodiesel is not to be encouraged. Farmland for fuel production is a morally bankrupt concept.

First we must establish a policy against future sod-busting of native grasslands and prairie

NO - let them make their own business decisions

Let's not use corn here, it's not that efficient. Are there grasses/ other options that don't use as much energy to produce the fuel as they provide? What kinds of plants do we grow here that would fall into this category? Are wood chip fuels planned? How efficient are these?

Again, this system is complicated and implications should be fully understood before adopting.

I do not believe that growing food for use as a fuel is ethical or moral. It is a BAD thing.

Great idea for oil seed crop and bio-diesel. Your ideas may conflict see AFW 1

How were the 20% arrived at? Is it doable? What are the negative effects of producing biodiesel?

Again, where is the food for hungry people going to come from if our farm products are converted to energy?

Biodiesel is not the answer if it is being produced from corn

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

How do you use this stuff in the Winter?? Get real.

Food to Fuel is absolute insanity. The poor are hit hardest by the increased food costs this is already causing across the nation.

it takes more energy to create one gallon of biodiesel

strong biodiesel incentives - production side and consumer side (incentives to purchase diesel vehicles)

One of the single most important things we can do. And fast, before the Dakotas beat us to the punch.

Should be market driven

New vehicle emissions need to be looked at....

Bio-diesel is either cost effective or it is not, forcing it into the market will only drive up the cost

Biodeisel production requires more energy than it produces. Unless more efficient methods of production become available, why would this be a good idea (other than it sounds good)?

Why not veggie oil?

There are so very many ramifications wrt biofuel. Please research the farming community before enacting any of this.

Again, only if economic on its own terms.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. I doubt whether any Montana farmers had any input in this section.

If this a voluntary program

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

Where exactly are we expected to produce these biofuels at?

As of the latest research biodiesel production uses more fuels for manufacturing fuel than the net gain. Plus the costs are extremely high

Incentives to utilize all resource production opportunities should be pursued.

Use my money again to be an incentive to produce something that there is not an overwhelming demand for. If you want to use my money to invest in an industry invest in a tried and proven product like, coal, oil, Nuclear power.

Costs more (energy) to produce it. 2 to 1. Good for the farmers

THIS IS A TERRIBLE IDEA FOR MONTANA. The production and consumption of biodiesel from crops has serious negative effects around the country, including water and soil depletion, air and water pollution, genetic pollution from biotech crops, and the list goes on. Let's plant FOOD here instead.

Must be able to show that system-wide CO₂ production from biodiesel is significantly less than from existing diesel.

Farmers prefer to grow food not fuel.

Be careful we eat plants and grains law of supply and demand applies

this is just a bunch of b.s. the way that I understand it it takes almost a gallon of fossil fuel to make a gallon of biodiesel. not very smart unless you have invested in the biodiesel or you are a farmer. Also there is no way that we can produce all of the plant necessary. As I see it the price of food is going to go up because there will be less and less land set aside for food production.

Incentives are fine as long as they don't come from Highway construction funds and that bio diesel does not become a mandate.

Climate Change Advisory Committee Bio-Diesel recommendations Study Recommendation: Montana should produce the following %s of the 2004 diesel fuel consumption by the targeted dates.

2004 Diesel fuel consumption (MDT) 372 million gallons

2010 2% 7 million gallons per year (gpy)

2015 10% 37 million (gpy)

2020 21% 74 million (gpy)

2006 Montana Oilseed Crop Production (*Montana Ag Statistics)

Crop Acres Production % Oil Gallons/Acre

Sunflowers *3500 1278 lbs/acre 3355-102

Canola *9800 1120 lbs/acre 3660-127

Safflower *37,000 750 lbs/acre 3735-83

Mustard *6,900 430 lbs/acre 61

Flaxseed *33,000 359 lbs/acre 51

Camelina ? 1000 lbs/acre 4053

1 Gallon of oil produces .8 gallons of bio-diesel

1 gallon of oil weighs approx. 7.5 lbs.

I've included two sets of numbers for gallon/acre where I've found two sources. There seems to be a wide variation between sources of data. The lower numbers come from Utah State University data and the higher numbers come from Wikipedia.

Extend biodiesel production incentive to community and farmer owned biodiesel refineries that meet the diesel needs of farmers first and perhaps some for other consumer needs. This has to be done on existing cropland.. NOT by bring new lands into production which would actually encourage more GHG emissions.

Incentives are fine as long as they don't come from Highway construction funds and that bio diesel does not become a mandate.

We will need this for transportation of food-stuffs into the future.

As long as it isn't the law. Make it voluntary.

Rather than supplementing fossil fuels, alternatives to internal combustion engines should be made the norm and affordable.

I don't think biodiesel is all that its made out to be. The overall effect on climate change is much less than originally identified and it has the potential to increase livestock feed which could hurt the Montana agriculture community. The amount of livestock feed far outweighs the amount of biodiesel production.

Biodiesel is a great idea, but doesn't it pollute from the usage of additional fertilizer?

Biodiesel is a pipe dream without tax subsidies to support it. Taking food out of production is morally wrong. Participating Montana legislators, ranchers & farmers need to go to the Sudan & explain this policy to starving families.

Bio fuels are harder on the environment than fossil fuels are...

Only from cellulose-based stock - NOT food grains such as corn, etc.!

I think the jury is still out on the actual energy efficiency of biodiesel fuels.

This will hurt us in other areas.

Go with 25% by 2013

Biofuels are quite controversial and may release more carbon than they save (article in the Christian Science Monitor). (Check latest facts on this) This may not be the answer.

Not proven to add to supplies of fuel. Energy consumer not producer.

Economics needs to drive this industry or it won't be sustainable. Incentives may be required to get it started. Biodiesel has as much of a carbon foot print as regular diesel.

???

Biodiesel is no better for the environment than conventional low-sulfur diesel. Yes, CO2 is lower with biodiesel, but NOx and SOx are increased. This is "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

This approach can jeopardize gains achieved via CRP, and must not be encouraged at the expense of native grassland or forests.

Grow Hemp

raise costs

These are private sector concerns - not those of government.

Yes; as I understand it, biodiesel is a better option than ethanol.

Biodiesel is not clean burning. It is also dirty to produce (with coal power used in this process). Growing the corn for biodiesel is a problem in itself. Corn requires more water than is appropriate in the arid west, and requires petroleum-based fertilizers.

Feeding the world is going to be a bigger problem. Maybe we should build refineries instead of making fuel out of food.

Look at the true costs (tilling, fertilizing, harvesting, processing, soil carbon, soil fertility, ect.) of biodiesel and proceed only if the analysis comes up favorable in relation to petrochemicals.

The market should drive these things not the government.

Biodiesel production competes for food. It makes sense predominantly in a localized, decentralized system where farmers produce the fuel to run their farm equipment, not to supply all of Montana, let alone the nation.

I don't believe that we should use farm land and food sources for fuel. This could create another set of problems. We need to be looking at solar, wind, and possibly hydrogen powers.

Montana lacks the population density to source the raw materials for bio-diesel. It would be a giant waste of money here. I've designed bio-diesel plants and it fails the economics test.

I disagree with using any food crops for BioDiesel Productions. Instead support R+D to find ways to use non-edible plant cellulose as biodiesel fuels.

Bio diesel production uses more energy than it makes.

I believe the cost and environmental impacts of manufacturing biodiesel and other 'natural' fuels are unknown.

This will only drive up feed costs to cattle ranchers and all food costs to consumers from beef to vegetables.

Biodiesel scares me, a la ethanol. We can hardly afford to feed our families with grain-related increases, and the impact on the world's poorest (ie. Mexicans reliant on corn) has been devastating.

Biodiesel is showing that it is probably worse for the atmosphere than no at all.

I've concerned about depending on fuel needs through a source that can potentially fail due to weather, or any number of unforeseen circumstances.

Separate the issues of farmer subsidy from energy production. The market is best at telling farmers what is best to grow.

The % are too low. We need to step it up!

Feed stocks? Produce fuel from feed stocks? The world needs food!

These efforts should only proceed if it is proven, in advance, that biodiesel production and use truly is a net carbon reduction, including all factors (such as production of petrochemical fertilizers, tractor fuel, processing energy expenditure, etc.).

This may seem fine however, the oil and gas companies have a vested interest already involved with supplying Ag companies especially the fertilizer and pesticide companies with their petroleum derived products. Bio-diesel will need more crops that in turn will need more of the fertilizer and pesticides that are petroleum based. Which will really not help towards cleaning up of our environment and will probably pollute more ground and ground water directly than occurs now.

Make certain that this is really a benefit once all costs are taken into consideration. Studies are showing little to no benefit depending on how much extra land is cultivated that was previously a natural carbon capturing ecosystem.

Bio is another alternative that is not entirely cost effective as of yet and in some cases does not work very well.

Yes, but put money toward research to determine if the percent of diesel can be brought down from the common figure of 80% in this mixture.

Bio diesel is not as efficient as regular diesel. Put resources to Hydrogen a true long term solution.

Bio-diesel has not been proven reliable in cold climates.

Only if increase in non-food crops does not affect increase in food prices across the board as it currently is doing.

I am for Bio-Diesel development if it doesn't need tax payer support to keep it running.

MUST result in a net positive yield of energy -- otherwise may help energy independence, but not GHG cuts. Human food sources aren't appropriate for biodiesel because of market impact. This is much more complex than it appears. Much depends on HOW the stuff is grown (how energy-intensive production is)

As long as it doesn't relate to the increased loss of habitat. Areas that were CRP cannot go into the production of bio-fuels if they have been in the program for more than 10-years!!

Should not be mandated.

Biodiesel takes farm land away from crops and causes food prices to go up. This is difficult for the poor to deal with.

Research suggests that if we take all the agricultural land in North America and Europe we can only produce 20% of the fuel demand of the US. I don't see this as a solution to anything.

While we support the use of incentives, we cannot support mandates.

Too costly and totally inefficient.

Hurt livestock producers!!!!

Some forms of biodiesel actually increase GHG emissions.

Right! Use the plants to run the trucks! Where will the food come from for the trucks to haul?

Absolutely no GM crops in MT!

Here is an area we should all get behind - not so much for the CO2, but for energy independence. Let's not use our food for fuel. Again, what is the effect of these hair brain ideas like this and Ethanol on the price of food. If you think the rainforest is on the way out now see what happens when poor people in these areas can grow corn and make a buck.

most efficient method to make BTU's with low carbon input.

The world is already in trouble for enough food because of the production of biofuel production. This is not a good idea to promote.

obviously if it requires more fuel than it produces, or is subsidized to redistribute costs, this won't be a viable program. I do think it's worth a try, and should be given a chance to get off the ground.

Biofuel are an economic, social, and environmental disaster waiting to happen. They will KILL our water supply.

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.

Effects of biofuel production should be carefully evaluated with regard to effects on native plant and animal populations.

I worry that these incentives will only encourage the damaging farming practices of today's commercial farmers in their attempt to produce lots of crops for biodiesel. We should put our money into alternative transportation- such as compressed air technology.

Just use the wood wasted in the forests from forest fires and we would have more than enough energy without all this needless creativity.

Biodiesel must also be affordable at the pump.

As above. If you can buy some group into an idea disconnected with reality, you increase your voter base.

No Biofuels. TOO WATER INTENSIVE.

while biodiesel looks good for emissions, it also converts ecosystems to monocultures. we need to look at specific ecosystems and what is most appropriate for that local system.

Fine under a free market system.

This distorts the market and imposes certain crop production on the state.

Growing food makes more sense than growing fuel. Let the market decide.

Biodiesel can be made from almost anything. Hemp is a great example of a great source for biodiesel

More Incentives?????

Really good!

or more

But be careful about the environmental costs of biofuels.

Goals too low.

We are killing consumers with the increased cost of crop produced for fuel instead of feed. Many of these crops are detrimental to the land, and will require chemical fertilizers to maintain levels of production.

Be sure biodiesel product does not cost more energy to produce than it provides.

NO NO NO biodiesel does not work at present. Energy in virtually equals energy out! This is bad technology unless we find something else besides food stuff to make bio-diesel (like switchgrass in Brazil)

good.

Cars can run on water. GMC knows how - they're just trying to sell their hybrid so they don't lose money. Water tech exists.

biodiesel should come from algae, hemp, rape, and other non food plants.

Biodiesel and ethanol aren't going to be long term solutions.

As suggested in TLU-6, there needs to be verification that the end result of this production results in lower net carbon being produced.

It seems to me I have read new concerns about biodiesel. Can't rate this one.

You should analyze the effects of this policy on food costs.

Only if it saves more CO2 than it produces. Then in proportion to the amount its saves.

It's questionable whether there is a net energy gain or loss by producing biodiesel. Get the efficiencies there & the market will sort it out.

We shouldn't use corn or any other crop which requires so much energy (water and fertilizer) to grow.

I already sell my manure. Will I get even more money for it with tax payer subsidies?

Does not seem to be an economically viable direction without some scientific breakthrough. Moves problems elsewhere.

Make sure that plants used for biodiesel don't require a lot of carbon to produce, like corn!! Ethanol does not make sense when corn is used.

what are we going to eat?

Let the marketplace drive the production and consumption of biodiesel.

Biodiesel is not the answer. It costs as much to produce as it's supposed to save. It (biodiesel) is less efficient than real gas or diesel.

Only if the carbon expended in growing biodiesel is taken into consideration AND there is a net benefit

biodiesel can be produced from almost anything and should be made from refuse

If we are creating the biodiesel from crops other than corn. Using corn to create biodiesel is only continuing our dependence on petroleum fuels.

Provide incentives only for biodiesel production that truly results in a net savings of energy.

With the recent upturn in the price of grains, the incentive will have to be pretty large to ensure feedstocks are grown for biodiesel.

Increase percentage a lot. 5% by 2010, 20% by 2015, 60% by 2020.

While we support the use of incentives, we cannot support mandates.

No. Don't force this issue. When viable alternatives happen, they will.

Water is our most precious and scarce resource. Plants used in making Biodiesel require large amounts of water.

Only if it doesn't take away from food crops. Biomass makes more sense.

If cheaper Than Diesel

Look at this carefully, concept sounds rosy, but the net results are not.

Something other than corn for the biofuel. It takes more water and costs more to convert that other sources. Plus the cost of cort products is going way toooo high

This is likely a taxpayer loses mandate that is similar to the ethanol from corn boondoggle that doesn't save any energy or reduce any GHG, just increases taxes and fuel and food costs.

Bio fuels are worse on the environment than fossil fuesl!

There should not be an incentive to sodbust/plow native prairie.

This removes the incentive for new, continued development!

Too ambitious

This needs to be carefully weighed with actual net gain. The fuel required to grow the crops, and particularly the water use needs to be considered.

Be flexible. Better ideas might be yet to come. Is biodiesel technology perfected yet? I've heard that there are unexpected problems with leaky seals and insufficient lubrication in some applications.

We have to bury the internal combustion engine and its spewing tailpipe.

Goals are pretty lofty. Biodiesel makes a lot more sense than ethanol from the energy efficiency standpoint. Unfortunately ethanol became a political darling first. But unless our climate changes to much warmer and much wetter, Montana will never be a major producer of biofuels.

Corn based is stupid waste that does not compute out! Grass okay.
at \$20 a bu for wheat who' going to grow a lower returning crop of anything?

it depends on the plant used to produce biodiesel. Some plants are not energy efficient for converting into biodiesel

Use Non-food bio-fuels

Biofuels are unsustainable, both economically and environmentally, and especially in a water-constrained state like Montana.

Biodiesel gells faster in winter time than regular #2 diesel.

ALLOW FOR MORE OIL DRILLING TO DECREASE OUR DEPENDANCY ON FOREIGN OIL. Biodiesel and other bio-fuels are contributing negatively to GHG emissions. Plus most of the vehicles in this country do not run on bio-fuels. The cost of programs such as this is truly incomprehensible, when you take all factors into consideration. PLUS PEOPLE EAT CORN-- what does this do to the fact that we need to eat?

A careful study of the energy needed to produce biodiesel as well as the scale of biodiesel plants needs to be done before going blindly into large-scale production. What unintended consequences of large-scale biodiesel production might there be?

I don't think that biodiesel is the answer. It's only a bandaid at best and actually uses excessive energy to produce. It helps boost the revenue for farmers and that is good as it helps to prevent our farmers from selling off land for development.

There is a growing concern about rising food costs as ag producers chase the potential returns on biodiesel crops. The cost of food is already rising rapidly. Folks can choose not to drive or seek lower cost transportation but they cannot choose not to buy bread or soy or milk or other essential food.

Biodiesel and ethanol production should be approached cautiously as there is a risk of depletion of soils from over use as well as the risk (based on recent studies) that biofuels can have a greater GHG than even fossil fuels due to destruction of virgin CO₂ sequestering forests and fossil fuel inputs for growing biofuel crops.

I am against the development of biofuels for more reasons than I have time to enumerate here. Let's grow FOOD crops and conserve energy so we don't have to put more precious agricultural land into production to feed our always-hungrier, never-satisfied thirst for fuel!

ARN'T WE DOING THIS NOW???

Not at the expense of conservation reserve lands. They should not be put back in production for biodiesel. We need to be careful with this one.

More information on the efficiency of biodiesel in all its various forms would be helpful.

IF biodiesel is made from the most efficient resources - which does NOT include corn - research what works first.

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

No clearcuts for farm land though! That neutralizes any good you are trying to do.

waste of time and money

What does ag community say about these goals? Reasonable?

Didn't the legislature already put incentives into law. We should see if those work before we go further.

This is an unrealistic goal. According to Farm Bureau it would take over 1/2 of our wheat acreage and our oil seed production would need to increase by 30% to meet all of these goals. And, when done, they are not price competitive.

I do not support the marginal efficiency (and, according to some studies, negative efficiency) of converting food grains into bio-fuel. When the cellulose conversion technology improves, then I would support such measures.

Any demonstration or implemented feed stocks should result from disturbed native rangelands nor take away from food production potential.

No!No!No! Our capacity to produce food must in no way be impaired nor can the profiteering from fuel/energy industry be allowed to impact food prices.

I am concerned about the diversion of ag lands from food to fuel. If attempts are made to mitigate loss of ag lands from food to fuel production, I can support biodiesel.

Converting waste to biodiesel is good. I'm not sure about incentives to growers.

Biodiesel is NOT a proven alternative to reduction of greenhouse gasses and therefore should be put on the market on a very limited test market for 10 years minimum.

Biofuels should only be produced with waste products, waste crop, or non productive land. Diverting productive land to fuel use is insane. Without these assurances, I cannot support this.

I wouldn't want to see regulation that displaced food producing farm land with fuel producing farm land. Food security is far more important than fuel security.

These are very low goals. Montana can do much more, much faster -- particularly in regards to biodiesel.

Encouraging crop-based biodiesel will increase CO₂, as native grasslands will be tilled, causing an enormous release of stored carbon. It will also stress rivers, due to the high water requirements for production.

Excellent idea!

possibly OK but I'd want to see the impact on foodstuff prices. The corn/ethanol program has been very adverse.

Use our natural resources to benefit Montana and bring higher paying jobs to this state.

latest reports indicate bio- fuels are not the answer.need to use solar and wind, cleaner energy and promote conservation.

Incentives for biodiesel production will be important.

Depends on plant source of biodiesel. Food sources are driving worldwide costs of food to the poor. Non-food source materials encourages for biodiesel.

Biodiesel must be developed in light of environmental and economic considerations. It must ensure real GHG reductions and econ. growth.

It is becoming increasingly attractive to withdraw farm land from CRP and place it into active production, possibly offsetting carbon benefits associated with CRP land. Need more information on relation between inputs (fertilizers, pesticides, irrigation etc) and non-productive CRP land.

Remove the administrative barriers to allow residues to be used as feed stocks.

We would need to make sure that the total loop of carbon released with biofuels is truly a reduction from conventional fuels.

Against mandates for biodiesel and other agri fuels.