

RCII-2 Comments
Recommendation 2
Market transformation and technology development programs

Government meddling/incentives rarely result in progress. Montana should be working to remove barriers to progress not impeding them by adding bureaucracy that adds no value to the end product. Furthermore, this report was based on a politically correct directive which assumes there is a man-made climate crisis. While this assumption has the backing of the media and politicians it has little support from the scientific community. Hence the reporting by the media of the relative minority that support the theory.

Is that like the low-energy light bulbs that are all the rage? Those things each contain a warning label that they contain mercury and must not be disposed of without proper governmental supervision. Lets not rush into implementing things to which we don't understand the long term ramifications.

Incentives are good, but I'm against funding an education program.

Should include HVAC, commercial and industrial appliances (not just residential/homeowner appliances)

I recommend tax credits for more efficient appliances.

Giving consumers information on things that save energy is important.

Provide for well made products. Not ones that last a couple years. I have appliances that work very well that were probably from the 60's. Although not super efficient the cost to replace should be taken into account. Energy efficient won't mean anything if the more appliances are sent to the land fill. Figure in the cost of energy both in materials and work to make items.

We took advantage of an existing program to install solar panels, a more energy efficient furnace, and to upgrade some windows in our home and rental properties.

Provide useful and factual information then let the market decide.

must be afford able to all comsumers.

Let consumers decide how they allocate their money.

Ratepayers may look at this to update their appliances if the incentive makes it worth the effort. Conservation is a way to help alleviate increase demand in the future.

The incentives should include more tax breaks for energy efficient changes, and you might want to consider some way to extend the incentives to renters.

Much, much better approach.

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

Incentives and education cost money. Who pays?

Providing incentives, through tax credits and/or rebates as done in many other states, it the best way to encourage consumer demand for high-efficiency products.

no reference to end cost

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.

Is there any rationale for not doing this?

I support only if it is not taxed.

As our population grows the need for energy will increase if we do not use fossil fuel we will revert back to the dark ages. Nuclear energy and biomass from our forests must be used. Cut the trees.

It would be real nice if this was written in human-speak instead of bureaucratic jargon. "Teach everybody in the state all the ways they can conserve energy."

There already are incentives for energy efficient appliances - they cost less to operate and they create less pollution - we could just put in place a mechanism that really clarifies that to those who might not understand that quite yet.

Concentrate funding to lower/subsidize cost of renewables instead. "If you build it they will come." Thus outreach should not be as high priority as mandates, subsidies and continuing R&D.

waste of money. you can not force people to do anything. the government should not educate. the government should not infringe on any aspect of our personal lives.

Has potential if left on a voluntary basis and does not compel compliance. Will largely benefit those most able to independently afford technology upgrades.

My concern with all the incentive programs is: how will this be financed? Increased taxes? I think most Montanans will be ok with a small increase in taxes, but if we try doing all the incentives it may require a large tax increase. In that case, we should implement the programs gradually, or just do the ones with the most potential benefit.

I might be more inclined to support if the cost were comparable

Go further.

Can't we move a little faster?

I always support greater education!

The incentives (especially financial incentives) is very important. Without legislation requiring steps be taken, the general tendency is to do nothing. Incentives are important....we're only human, after all!

It seems critical that we spend the time and money to educate the public. Individual action is important in principal and in real benefits to energy conservation.

Grade the levels of efficiency. Energy Star rating is an absolute minimum. There is much better. Support that. Some Energy Star stuff is not acceptable as it is too big or simply unnecessary in any and every case. It has the rating to satisfy a consumption-based economy.

I like incentives and education as way to move forward.

I think that education is particularly important, especially in informing people that the slightly higher expense of more efficient appliances is worth the savings in the long run.

Incentive programs will help to achieve the desired result.

State and federal incentives are already in place. You have to have a tax liability to use a tax credit. Many Montanans earn so little they never have a tax liability. I am against more welfare. Likely little impact change

How are these incentives paid for? I would suggest that taxing the coal fired power plants that ratepayers have already paid for would be a good start.

How much will this cost? Who pays for the education and outreach? As a taxpayer, I am opposed to my tax dollars going to this proposal.

OK AS LONG AS IT DOES NOT COST TOO MUCH AND IS NOT REGULATORY

What is a "market transformation"?

Incentives are not needed, education concerning the effectiveness of new technologies would seem appropriate

The tax rebates for higher efficiency furnaces, window, insulation, etc should continue. We should get the federal incentives back.

Absolutely. With the emergence of new technologies that impact individuals ability to improve efficiency, conserve, or generate energy there will need to be an educational effort for this to be successful.

ultimately make all appliances and equipment on the market energy efficient.

again look at the cost to we the people

Incentives are good. But I do not support adding to the government bureaucracy, if it can be done with current law expenditures, fine otherwise no way.

Who will pay for the incentives? Won't the energy efficient appliances come about as they are the only ones being produced at present?

Who will pay for the education and outreach? Has this been relayed to the consumer?

This is fine if it is voluntary and does not mandate change.

For low income people, provide them with energy efficient items for free (lightbulbs) or at a reduced cost

With the prices rapidly increasing, saving energy is a matter the free market can handle without government involvement.

Waste of money. If a customer wishes to learn about more efficient equipment he currently can very easily. The government does not need to hold our hands on this.

Let customers choose energy-efficient appliances of their own free will, without trying to influence or force the market.

I do not support any measures that will increase taxes on current resources, nor increased spending from the General Fund.

I approve of incentives and education as long as the education is not biased and refrains from "political correctness". I believe that people will do what is best only if they can afford it and making affordable by "punishing" those with means is reprehensible.

I don't want my tax dollars going for this control measure. Global warming is not a fact.

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

The above video destroys the myth of human caused global warming. Get informed. The truth shall make you free.

Let the Free Markets do it.

Talk of the dumping ground coming to Montana is only a scare tactic being used by those entities that have a monetary interest in promoting this aspect of energy conservation. Appliances and other devices that are used by the citizens of Montana will evolve with the rest of the country as technology moves forward. Any incentives providing opportunities are ok, but we must use care that these incentives are not being hidden as a carrot when in reality the stick is around the corner.

This "mechanism" will likely be financial incentives since government does not have "money" but all of its money comes from its tax base "citizen" then we are going to tax the base to give back to the base the incentives to change to more energy efficient equipment. Not a very money efficient process.

Mandating what the market should take care of.

I feel that education is never wasted. just make sure that you are informing everyone to both sides of the issue.

Markets should determine measures taken to conserve energy. Market will dictate purchase of energy efficient houses and appliances

This is already happening. Marketing does not happen on a local level anymore, consumers see ads for higher efficiency, or see it on the internet. If it is not available locally they buy it elsewhere if they can afford it.

Making sure consumers really are able to know how to select energy efficient appliances, plus adequate incentives particularly those with less resources to make changes.

Markets should determine measures taken to conserve energy. Market will dictate purchase of energy efficient houses and appliances

incentive is already there, energy efficient items cost less to operate.

This is hard to do in such a rural state with such diverse sources of energy, but necessary.

I like the idea of incentives to get people to use energy efficient equipment. I think we need to start this climate change effort at the level of the people. From there, other reductions will be seen.

Clearly, this is a first step ~ the federal government needs to be solidly behind (and funding) this initiative.

This will only fly if similar measures are adopted by most states-- otherwise it is perceived as encroaching on individuals' rights. The successful argument is that we all share a common pool of energy and resources, of which inefficient machines use more than their share.

The more incentives the more likely people are to adopt the more efficient practices.

There is no other way to obtain a fast and lasting impact on our energy consumption thereby eliminating the need for coal burners for a while.

would include a program to replace inefficient wood stoves state wide.

As with oil and forests, we can make our resources more long-lived via efficiency. Without efficiency, Montansns will be left highly vulnerable to extreme disruption from being run off a cliff.

tax breaks for the rich-those who can afford new technology.

No.

Again, not far reaching enough.

don't trust the government to tell the truth on this.

General tax dollars should not be used to support private purchases.

As long as taxes and cost of living are not increased.

yes! and start providing incentives as soon as possible. by 2009 sounds great!

This program must be lean and mean and administered very carefully so costs of state government and taxes do not go up.

What will be done with disposal of old appliances? Part of the policy should be a recycling program to properly dispose of the appliances being replaced.

Education programs should already be in place. These could be modified instead of starting something new.

Education about these issues is one of the most important steps in reducing our footprint.

this needs to be done atleast by 2009

Spend taxpayer monies

The incentive for using energy efficient appliances or equipment is lower energy costs for the consumer. Let the market and the consumer decide. The state should stay out of it.

Standards better than incentives: mfrs. should charge what it costs to produce & consumers should know the true costs of what they buy. Costs shouldn't be externalized.

This recommendation contains new programs of unknown costs and care should be given in providing incentives without knowing the costs.

YES, a must do.

MPA supports the use of incentives, but this recommendation contains new programs at unknown cost. Care should be given to review cost impact.

Incentives, market data and new products or technology on energy savings are all key to implementing conservation goals and saving money.

If government had been reading the "Mother Earth News for the last 20/30 years, all the information you need is in these books. The citizens of this great State, do not need government as a 'Big Brother.' Government needs the people to guide THEM!

This would quickly turn into a propaganda arm of State Government controlled by who ever is in power.

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.

Subsidies? Did't work too well in the USSR.

I Don't want to pay anymore for my electricity

What markets and who pays, the consumer?

Conservation is a worthy goal, but at what cost, and to whom?

Make renewable energy affordable to all. I cannot afford the current costs. I have bought appliances that are energy-efficient, but I cannot afford major changes.

This is written in jargon. Do you mean "to promote energy efficient products and practices? As for energy efficient buildings. How to do that is well known.

We should provide incentive, but we do not need to expend additional tax dollars or grow the government to increase awareness, other than what can be done for free or minimal cost with existing staff.

Should include incentives for buildings also.

Old inefficient appliances need to be removed from households via subsidized swap-for-new programs. People here can't afford Energy Star. If they could get it, they would.

Better to subsidize the poor to help them update their appliances.

A well informed population will result in more cooperation in conserving energy and using renewable sources. The high prices of fuel today should make ethanol production more competitive.

Giving tax breaks isn't the answer & that's where this type of program is based. Instead allow the market to push for higher efficiencies without so many government restrictions & regulations.

These are terribly important questions but the writing is incomprehensible. Are we all going to fry just because we can't communicate with each other?

Often a waste of money because consumers and businesses already maximize money saved as much as possible.

Who will fund the incentives? Why are efforts aimed at only renewable energy? Manufacturers of appliances as well as those who sell them will educate the public about how they can save energy and money. State does not need to create another program.

Shorten the time frame.

MPA supports the use of incentives, but this recommendation contains new programs at unknown cost. Care should be given to review cost impact.

People should be made aware of their options. However, to impose "preferences" through actions such as the imposition of the fluorescent-bulb requirement at the federal level is total bullshit.

Consumers will respond if energy eff. appliances and equipment is available and not too expensive.

Let free market take its course. GM is finding that the public will buy fuel efficient cars, even though they might not believe in the current hysteria over global warming.

Existing programs are adequate. There simply is no reason to spend more State resources on this.

if the price goes high enough people should look for efficiencies

Yes! Europe is so far ahead of us in this area--their energy efficiency is space-age while we're clunking around 30 years behind.

Rural electric co-ops have been educating their consumers for a long time, without government mandates.

set higher efficiency standards rather than pay people to buy efficiency.

Incentives ALWAYS work better than mandates.

I believe this can be done and may even save money!

I am for education, but it must be a complete education, presenting all the facts available, not just those supporting this "man is responsible for climate change" belief.

Emphasis should be placed on extensive education and cost benefit/payback analysis - lifecycle costing should be part of basic education

NO BACKGROUND IN THIS AREA

The state should be lobbying congress for R & D funds for universities. Our universities could then make the decision whether to compete for these funds or not. Anything we can do, for example, to move solar technology to cost efficient home use would be of immense benefit.

Any and all improvements that we make as individuals will set the tone for those who remain unsure.

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

Also have programs/ financial help for people who can't afford to upgrade to energy efficient equipment. Education and incentives to move people toward energy efficiency are a good idea.

There is no lack of information available on energy conservation. It is in every magazine, taught in the schools, attached to our bills and appliances and in every newspaper and many news broadcasts. There is no need to spend more money on this.

I think education is the key for public support!

In the possible legislative action column, one must point out that It is not only "new" technologies that can save energy and utilize renewable sources. Some venerable "old" technologies (especially in energy conservation) work just fine.

Strike using renewables and add clean coal

Too soon to accomplish

Consumer demand is necessary for the transformation to work.

I remember the Arizona program for electric cars, you could get an electric car and get a great tax rebate (pay hundred for each thousand of actual cost). Almost bankrupted the AZ goverment, can you set it up like that?

It seems people listen most when there pocket book is involved. Very important for people to have education and incentives.