

CC-7 Comments
Recommendation 55
The state's own GHG emissions

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

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.

???

Remove subsidies that encourage the state to produce GHG emissions, and the free market will force change.

Realistic goals based on Montana's piece of the puzzle.

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

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.

The biggest source of air pollution here is coal and automobiles.

huh?

GHG????

Only if they are on the same level as California, Oregon, and Washington state.

Studies show that there is zero climate benefit to investing in GHG reduction infrastructure and monitoring. Clearly there is no consensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

The state's low density is likely to make this effort an excuse to do little or nothing.

Garbage

Goal is too low!

No explanation of survey question...probably another trick.

Waste of time and money.

Federal stuff is enough

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

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

Start with a reduction of hot GHG emissions that are generated from Helena every day.

Now this is something Government should be in. the more we talk the more CO2 we emit. It's called hot air, and we could sure use less of it.

At least they wouldn't be Californias. Survuy submitted by a Fort Shaw mother trying to make ends meet who resents having to drive twice as far to vote who resents having the rural vote marginalized by gerrymandering.

The state can lead by example where practical

no such thing

Seems reasonable, but lets not set examples that result in increased taxes or costs to Montanans unless they fully support them. We need to move in the right direction, but lets really understand the benefit we will actually achieve with each action and its associated costs.

What?

???

I would love to see the State lead by example.

raise taxes

What is the cost to the taxpayer for this action versus actual benefits derived?

Not a problem so don't waste money on it.

This state is so sparsley populated and has so much open space with little industry, that it is impossible to agree that Montana is a serious contributor to GHG emissions.

These levels in all states need to be decided by the Federal System as I worry that each state will spin their own standards which could be skewed by more local politics.

GHG doesn't follow state lines.

Unclear of what this is saying.

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.

??

Must include production sources. It is untenable that Montana's Climate Change Action Plan does not account for 40% of the energy produced by the State, and that this failure of accounting results in a failure to meet the goals and objectives of the Plan when these sources are taken into account.

Good idea but will never work!!

a waste of tax money

What about all the emissions for electricity generation that is transmitted for use out of state?

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.

Really. Whoever made this up needs attention.

?

?????

Yes , lead by example !

reduce waste with out legislation.

No.

I agree, not because GHG's will be the death of us, but conserving fossil fuels will automatically reduce GHG emissions.

All the following are unrealistic, unnecessary, and way to costly.

OR BETTER

save energy

what a separate item on this?

SHOULD ALWAYS BE THE STATE GOAL

Lead by example.

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

lotsa words

?

faster

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

??