

AFW-7 Comments
Recommendation 44
Expanded use of biomass feedstocks for energy use

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

technology should be able to sustain itself.

Again, we need to measure the impact on food costs.

These activities should not be conducted by state government.

The best incentive is to stop taxing in the first place instead of giving some tax money back. Then, if the market supports something, we people have the money to invest in that thing if it seems profitable.

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.

Please don't assume that Montana will ever be allowed to harvest fiber from its forests. How is preserving "open space" consistent with harvesting fiber? This is classic Schweitzer. Talk the talk but, via appointments, make sure you never have to walk the walk.

Remove the subsidies that encourage bad behavior, and we won't need tax incentives to encourage good behavior.

We've got the resources we should use them for the benefit of the state!!

Not if the biomass could instead be returned to the land for healthier soils in the future.

Tax incentives are the wrong way to go.

Start sooner!

This ADDS greenhouse gas.

Biomass might not be the answer to our energy needs.

Good plan.

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

Money, money, money! Usually when things become economical to do, entrepreneurs emerge.

Really bad idea.

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.

Small potatoes in the big picture.

I originally come from a state where this technology worked very very well!

And I still can't have a wood stove in my house? Leave the biomass where it belongs: in the forest, turning into soil, and sequestering carbon.

Harvesting biomass depletes the soils of natural plant nutrients and soil carbon which must eventually be replaced with mined and petroleum derived commercial fertilizers.

Do not support the creation of more commercial incentives to log public forests!

Is this really cost effective?

We do it for oil and gas!

companies do not need tax incentives. public pressure will get the job done. if not public pressure, then competitive pressures (i.e. capitalism) will get the job done.

ONLY if it's based on sustainable growth and harvesting procedures!

Complex issue. We must not deteriorate air quality to promote biomass.

What is the impact on air pollution? I remember that wood burning stoves add to air quality problems.

Renewable resource efforts should not attempt to direct materials (e.g. wood products) away from value-added manufacturing to energy production without an equivalent increase in raw material availability.

It's gonna release GHG one way or the other, just fast or a bit slower. However, in a contained burn, maybe somehow "scrubbing" or chelating will be developed and we end up with Ca carbonate as a by-product to hold that carbon. Hmmm...

what about including paper waste that is not recyleable?
cereal boxes, cracker boxes, all that hard paper that is not corrugated cardboard!

Only if this biomass residue is not trees and bushes harvested for making energy. We need to collect the stuff that is burned in piles and use it. I am not sure what agricultural biomass is, since livestock and or wildlife eat most left overs from farming.

YES!

don't know anything about this one

These projects are already underway in most areas. Who is providing the tax incentives?
back to where the public pays twice

High tech solutions for low tech problems. Conservation first, then this on top of it. It is not the highest and best use of the materials.

Is this ethanol related? If so, change my vote to 1. If no, change it to a 5.

What resources? Taxpayer dollars? Government is growing too fast already!

WOULD ALSO HELP WITH HIGH FIRE FUELS PROBLEM

We need to get back to demand reduction.

Why burn thinned forests in piles when we could be burning this stuff in boilers and CHP generators? The Fuels for Schools program is a great start and should be expanded by the State.

NO - the federal government landholdings are a great storehouse of energy - they need to step up to the plate and be sincere about helping rural Montana - this is the big hangup - you do not need to provide an incentive

I encourage R&D in this area to understand the implications.

Concerned about how efficient this can be... transporting the biofuels etc...

This should have one of the highest priorities as it is based on technologies that are currently available and can GHG emission benefits along with economic benefits, that is the thermal applications are cheaper than any of the fossil fuels currently available other than coal but they don't have the mercury and sulfur emissions that coal has.

Incentives are a good idea and so is R&D

Only if you can get the Montana logging industry to meet the standards found in Eastern United States for "hogfuels".

You do realize that this means opening up the forests for harvest don't you?

Instead of all the wasteful slash pile burning going on in our forests, lets use it more efficiently!!

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

This would be a great "goal".

Depends on source of the woody biomass. Make sure is not incentive for otherwise unwise forest harvest.

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

Thompson Falls was a good example of biomass for schools. Let's expand that program.

The market should dictate when these are necessary not providing incentives by distribution of wealth, it's like the solar in the 70's too much cost and not sustainable

recycling is good,

there are paper mills that already use this feedstock now to keep there cost down.
a loss of this feed stock to competition could had higher costs to companys already using these products,also would they get tax incentives

Finally a good idea

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

Have to be careful not to deplete organic matter in soil by encouraging removal of too much straw.

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

Natural Resource development is the key here.

Another incentive to that the taxpayers must pay for. for unneeded and unwanted product. If there is a need the product will develop without incentives.

Need research

You better have the US Forest Service at the table with a guaranteed sustained supply or this will not fly. State and private cannot sustain or carry the feds much longer. Ask the enviro's what they will let you do.

Here you appear to have a good idea. Tax incentives and resources for R & D. This is what really gets people on board with conservation.

Do this as the opportunity arrives and do not mandate, often to the detriment of economy, the use of these systems.

This is much easier said than done. The cost of transporting woody materials to facilities is extremely high for the value received. It should not be another government program.

I AM ALL FOR USING BIOMASS FOR ENERGY PRODUCTION, BUT DOESN'T THIS WHOLE ISSUE CONFLICT WITH "CARBON FOOTPRINT" THEOLOGY?

Seems like a fair proposal so that natural resources are not wasted

In order to increase biomass one will have to harvest the commodity. You can't have it both ways, preserve the trees and wilderness and harvest also.

Yes provided that such harvest is done sustainably without impacting any loss of sequestered carbon

Seems like a fair proposal so that natural resources are not wasted

Maximum sequestration in forests is best effected by leaving the bio-mass in the forests. Diverse, multi-species boreal forests sequester twice the GhG compared to tree-farms. Leave trees standing in the forest or fallen on the forest floor for maximum carbon uptake.

As long as it is real and voluntary.

Good use of forest thinning project materials

Good idea.

Timber interests should appreciate this.

Only from cellulose-based feedstock.

wood slash from forestry thinning also

Research and development definitely.

???

Counterproductive. This is not to say that farming and forestry will have no place, but we may severely regret spending to increase use of woody biomass.

tax breaks for the rich raises taxes on the poor

and let them in for small diameter into wilderness to reduce fire

No.

Whatever works with the "woody" material as long as activity does not touch roadless areas.

Do not do this at the expense of ecosystem function.

Do NOT encourage the use of agricultural residues--they are what feed the soil and enables it to sequester carbon in the first place. We'll kill our soils if we take the crop residue off--residue is not "waste," it's what fuels the living system that cycles nutrients.

Not efficient or feasible. If it was the private sector would have already done it.

Must be certain the transportation and emissions associated with biomass energy production is significantly less than other methods (even coal could be cheaper and cleaner in certain scenarios).

Biomass is a good idea. Agriculture biomass???

Energy production from biomass is mainly dependent on a steady, reliable source of biomass. Current politics of "do not cut trees, even if already dead" is the main impediment.

But again, where does the funding come from?

I am concerned that a move toward biomass feedstocks might result in more forests being cut, which would be bad for forest health and would reduce CO2 reabsorption in taking away growing plants that essentially convert CO2 to oxygen.

Ok, as well.

Why give incentives; have the consumers pay for most of the production goes out of state

Spend

I support the general idea, but I believe it needs more research and statistics available for public education.

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

I don't believe the public has been given enough information about the negatives of biomass production--and I think that has been deliberate. There are byproducts of biomass production--some hazardous.

This must be accomplished with no net impact to other important forest resources: water, wildlife, fish, etc.

The largest biomass fuels we have are coal and oil use them.

Who is paying for all these tax incentives? Way too costly. We have the largest biomass in coal and oil. What about them?

good idea. Ask any custodian of the land for ideas. They have been doing it for years. However, what will a land operator say to you if you tell him how to run his business? And rightly so.

Here is an area we should all get behind - not so much for the CO2, but for energy independence.

The State should stay out of this and leave it to the private sector.

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.

May be a good idea for financing. Don't waste money on more research. It has already been done in Europe, developed proven technology. Swallow our pride and just copy what they are doing successfully.

God I love tax incentives. Its just like buying votes.

No Biofuels. TOO WATER INTENSIVE.

????

If this is an answer it will happen when it is economically viable.

We should be looking for ways to use woody biomass; the problem is availability and the cost and logistics of transportation.

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

Burn anything woody and you get CO 2

good idea.

do not use food plants (bi-products ok)

start with prairie grasses no corn

It may be necessary to allow more flexibility in the operating permits of existing coal fired plants to allow for the use of biomass.

Qualified support. The BTUs produced have to be much more than the BTUs invested in producing and delivering the biomass. Also we should not be using tax dollars from Montana citizens to subsidize liquid fuels production or electricity generation for power that will be exported. Let those folks provide for thier own.

Wait, AFW-5 wants to keep the land out of production.

gouge the tax payer why don't you!

If there were no added expense to the general public, it might be an idea to pursue.

Let marketplace dictate the use of biomass feedstocks.

Only for biomass near enough to the market to result in a true net savings in energy. Haul costs are generally prohibitive from remote forests.

Excellent. Establish woody and vegetation biomass recycling program in main urban areas, i.e. Billings, Bozeman, Butte, Helena, Great Falls, Livingston, Missoula, plus major valleys like Bitterroot, Galliton, and others.

Hey, how about deep sixing the BET?

This will only be possible if harvest increases from Federal ownership.

Would not want to see the rape of forest biomass by forest industry in pursuit of "green" fuels.

An excellent idea, but I don't like mandatory tonnage targets. What if another clean, cheap, renewable energy source shows up and we have these mandates for biomass?

There is way more potential for woody biomass than what is shown. 450 M Tons of wood residue/year is only about 13,000 truck loads that could be produced by treating 6-9 M acres per year. That would not make a dent state wide in the acres of fire fuel reduction treatment needs.

Maybe the Forest Service should donate the trees it thins in vegetation control projects to the biomass projects, rather than burning them in the field, causing unnecessary pollution.

Reduce carbon based burning.

There is some potential here, if the enviro's will let us harvest some of the stuff that is currently burning up in wildland fires/ USFS slash burns & prescribed burns.

Improved forest management programs focusing on thinning and dead woody debris removal.

What does the market want?

Where do you propose to get the funds for all the incentives?

NOT AT ALL, if this affects what we pay for our foods. And how do they come across "woody biomass"?

Will families soon be forced to choose between very expensive food or lower cost fuel/gas, relative to today's food prices. See comments above

This is okay for the short term but there must be an emphasis on stewardship of any biomass resources for the long run.

CAN THE PUBLIC HELP BY INCREASING WOOD STOVE USE???

Again, I do not know the cost-benefits of these technologies or on what scale they work. Any recycling, however, will benefit us in the long run.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation. Tentative support. As in AFW-3, I'm concerned about the impacts off over-harvesting to forest health, maturity and diversity. Need a commitment to restoration that is ecologically sound. Not just re-stocking. Trading food and wildlife habitat for biomass energy is a slippery slope.

This seems a good idea, and is gaining some ground in programs like "fuels for schools." But mandate is not way to go. Have to have available fuel stocks and incentives to get them delivered to users.

What are the short term consequences for air quality and the long term consequences for returning carbon to the soil?

This sounds like it would add Carbon to the atmosphere not reduce it.

woody-yes

Yes, utilize that waste

Agricultural biomass should stay on the farm in order to be turned into renewable fertilizer.

See report sent to Senator Lugar from William Dittl

Do not support if it will drive up food costs or generate food shortages.

Going to have to resume logging trees to get the biomass. Consider re-using "waste heat" in urban areas - to heat greenhouses and fish tanks for food production or to heat homes.

There are several barriers to remove before this can be implemented.

???