

ES-5 Comments
Recommendation 18

Incentives for advanced fossil fuel generation and carbon capture and storage or reuse (ccsr), including combined hydrogen and electricity production with carbon sequestration

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

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. Technology should be able to stand on its own merits without government incentives.

Interesting how the proposed goal in the first column is for incentives but the planned implementation in the second column instead is "require" the emissions level and provide the government with more control.

Technology is not yet developed.

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.

Can anyone say Environmental Police?

This sounds like too much government interference.

We should not waste another dime on fossil fuel extraction, use or technology. They should be phased out, as soon as possible. We cannot afford the costs that accompany coal, oil or natural gas.

Where will these pipelines carry CO2 to???

I think that CCSR should be mandatory for any new coal fired electric plants in MT.

No more eminent domain. Local energy, local responsibility for CO2, pollution, carbon, reclamation. No more facilities that produce carbon as emission. Put our energy into renewables, efficiency, conservation.

I OPPOSE eminent domain for this use. there is no reason (except higher up front costs to the developer) that these pipelines can't follow existing transportation corridors.

Algae also works for Carbon Sequestration.

This is not only nonsense but also dangerous for Montana's economy considering the Governor's appointments to this agency and the BER. Opper and the BER members would completely disregard adverse economic impacts in pursuit of their ideologic agenda.

Who bears the cost?

Eminent domain powers already are adequate. Only get involved to meet the constitutional requirements for health.

Where would the pipelines carry the CO2?

Eminent domain scares me a bit.

USA or USSR?

Not sure about eminent domain for power corridors. The MATL line is not good for farmers and landowners in its path.

Without significant technological break throughs this would be putting the cart before the horse.

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

Incentives for fossil fuel generation could be beneficial but I fear that the standards would be set so high that it's unlikely that any developer would be interested in locating in Montana-no matter how much coal we have. And authority to DEQ for rulemaking is downright scary.

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.

No matter how you cut it, coal-based generation is a method whose time has gone and it was terrible in its time. Now it is totally irrational and unacceptable.

I wonder if Tim Gregori expects these levels will be actually attainable within the next decade. I'm glad to see his name on the Climate Change Advisory Committee.

It would be nice if DEQ would become that forward thinking for a change

This is confusing. Why mix the topic of eminent domain with incentives? What is a pipeline that carries CO2? Oil pipeline? Sequestration pipeline?

Clean Coal is an oxymoron!

Again, I believe funding for carbon sequestration technologies should be a low priority.

Unnecessary. I do not support anything that restricts technology or fuel emissions because of so-called "global warming".

Eminent domain infringes on the rights of the people.

YES and mercury also

Carbon capture again assumes that CO2 is a problem. If CO2 is a problem maybe we should all stop breathing.

Wary about eminent domain for CO2 lines.

When's the deadline? What's the penalty for failure to implement the 100% removal of carbon from fossil fuel burning? Shutdown the plant?

Not a huge believer in incentivizing for-profit producers. Seems to me there's a reason (profit, lack of foresight, etc.) why I can still drive my grandfather's 1960 Ford pickup and essentially compete (mileage, carbon footprint, etc) with anything coming off the "showroom floor" today. Producers have failed consumers. The revolution will be demand-side not supply-side.

horrible idea. i have seen eminent domain DESTROY peoples' lives. never, never, never, even think about this. this is the worst form of government. governemnt should be inobtrusive, not stealing land from people.

Who put the words eminent domain in this survey? What were you thinking?

Eminent domain is permitted for any number of public uses, including utilities. Is legislation really need to do this? Yikes.

DEQ will need new resources to do this.

This is a mandate without clear benefits. Will drive up consumer costs.
Carbon sequestration technologies are not advanced enough to require this.

I don't really understand this one. The example mentions eminent domain. In general I am opposed to eminent domain.

Yeah, when China does!!!!!!

I think money would be better spent to get away from carbon-based energy. We already have plenty of that! But if industry is considering such plans, definitely needs to be controlled at state level carefully--too many well water and land (saline) problems to take it lightly, especially as agriculturally rich as MT is.

NO.

I don't understand this. If CO2 can be captured and put in pipes, where would it go? Would it just become more toxic waste we can't get rid of?

I am not in favor of eminent domain. Having lost significant land to eminent domain so that cities could build new suburbs, I am not a supporter of forcefully taking farmland to support city growth.

NOT in favor or using more coal. We need to get off of fossil fuels ASAP.

dubious technologies

Once again-added costs and government control.

Is there actually consensus on the CO2 sequestration, or is it a compromise with problem producers who don't want to really address the problem?

A little nervous about the eminent domain aspect of this. Must have stringent EIS requirements. Without incentives, research and development, and an implentation plan this is simply an added cost to fossil fuel plants. And that cost will ultimately be paid by the cosumer.
We need to moving away from fossil fuels.

Use the incentive approach when possible.

This assumes that DEQ will do a credible job, which is always a matter of genuine concern.

Carbon capture has more negatives than positives.

If these systems can provide the same level of net CO2 emissions as wind that has compressed air or other means of firming power, I guess I could support it. But I'm skeptical as to whether that can be accomplished without a higher degree of subsidies than renewables.

There is no scientific consensus to support investing in mandated CO2 reduction. Studies show that there is no climate benefit to such investments. Voluntary capture should be encouraged for industrial use such as enhanced oil recovery.

I am opposed to any emissions levels being established. This ultimately costs more and is passed on to the consumer. DEQ has enough to do without taking on such a project of requiring plans. How many new FTEs will be required? What is the cost?
WILL END UP COSTING CONSUMER. USE INCENTIVES AND FLEXIBLE GOALS INSTEAD.

Should be a close partnership with federal government to advance these particular plans.

DEQ can't handle current workload. But I strongly support carbon sequestration because it is the only way to reduce the amount of carbon in the atmosphere; all other options on the table only reduce the rate at which atmospheric carbon volume increases.
DEQ can't handle their current workload. This is a bad idea.

If we're going to be using fossil fuels, let's use them as cleanly as possible...but remember, reduce demand FIRST!

Non-agenda driven, scientifically driven education only - no incentives

Eminent domain? That's a snag.

I am against building pipeline corridors thro' sensitive habitats and undeveloped areas. I also believe we need to look at our eminent domain laws so that they are fair to everyone and not just corporate interests.

DEQ can't handle their current work load...so therefore this is a bad/dumb idea.
I strongly support carbon sequestration
more cost to the people

Good idea but Give the authority to a different state agency...not DEQ

Eminent domain huh.

A good idea but has a low rating because the governors and legislature for the last 12 years have emasculated the DEQ to where it is now a pro-industry agency. It is neglectful of the public health and the environment.

How can there be requirements when there is not a proven technology to meet the requirements?
How much will this cost? Has this cost been related to the general consumer?

Junk Science! Do some research. Reducing anthropogenic CO2 emmissions will accomplish nothing but drive the American economy into the toilet.

who pays for the research and does the average person see any return or benifit?

Again, we need to move away from fossil fuels.

I don't believe these mandates are necessary at this time.

Maybe, just maybe, we should have proven, practical, and affordable technology before we adopt it.

Not until I know more specifics. Too many pie in the sky proposals that take attention away from conserving energy and using renewable sources. (Coal and wood are NOT renewable.)

I cannot support ANY eminent domain program, regardless of the goals of that program. The same can be attained through fair market value sales, etc.

Though the liberal media worships those politically motivated scientists who claim that global warming is significantly affected by human CO2 emissions, there are many leading experts who say there is NO EVIDENCE FOR SUCH.

This question isn't settled, so let's stop acting like it is. Mars is also going through a global-warming trend right now. Did our CO2 emissions cause that?

Many leading scientists are stating that increased solar activity is much more to blame for global warming than human activity.

No eminent domain expansion is acceptable to the electorate. I will go collect signatures myself to repeal this if it passes. Giant oil companies need to deal with landowners straight up and with equal negotiating leverage. No expansion of the ability for Montanans private property to be taken!

Remember to include those exempted diesel generators that the refineries use in any air quality issues. I don't support eminent domain except as last resort.

this topic is over my head

The goal here should not be to sequester carbon, it should be to quit producing carbon emissions in the first place.

CO2 is not a pollutant - it is a natural constituent of the atmosphere.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. I do not support anything in this section. Montana's poor and middle class cannot pay any more for energy.

We cannot limit the ability of development of new energy with requirements that cannot be met with existing technology

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

CO2 issues remain to definitely prove that humans are the major cause of global warming.

NO EMINENT DOMAIN OVER MONTANA CITIZENS

Using eminent domain for pipelines for CO2 is insane for Montana. Giving DEQ more authority is also insane, as any time government is given more authority over its people the citizens are the losers.

"Establish eminent domain for pipelines. This is private property if the Montana Citizens that your are dealing with, I am no sure how I would like a new pipeline across my back yard or back forty for that matter.

What do you plan to do with the CO2 the pipelines are carrying?

Don't need more eminent domain for pipelines, especially for CO2. How about a string of NUCLEAR powerplants? Works for all of the other countries.

"enable eminent domain for pipelines" = erode any rights citizens still have to pursue happiness and own property.

Heavy handed to the extreme. DEQ rules would be draconian to say the least.....

Though I fully support the idea of this, I am wary of enabling eminent domain, especially if that should extend to residential areas. Would there be a system to check that eminent domain is not abused?

eminent domain is bothersome - willing seller/lessor attempt at least to begin with?

this seems extreme. we don't even know for sure if we are causing the global warming.

Agree that MT should work within region to develop standards and strengthen Major Facilities Citing act to allow for CO2 transport with eminent domain.

Not sure I agree with giving the Board of Environmental Review that task. Would rather see it group of elected officials

Cost?

NO.... again, emit less carbon, don't encourage carbon sequestration.

Agree that MT should work within region to develop standards and strengthen Major Facilities Citing act to allow for CO2 transport with eminent domain .Not sure I agree with giving the Board of Environmental Review that task. Would rather see it group of elected officials.

There is no such thing as clean coal. More utility easements/right-of-ways and their associated environmental problems, are not the way to go.

there is no idea of how to control CO2 that works yet.

Again any carbon legislation belongs at a Federal level so that we are operating on a level playing field with all other states. By just adding carbon legislation for Montana we will only be damaging our economy while all the other states benefit.

The eminent domain for CO2 pipelines is absolutely *unacceptable*.

Some level of CO2 control may be appropriate, but this goal would result in significant increases in energy costs while providing minimal benefit to the overall climate change that is happening. I think this issue should be addressed at the national level. Anything MT does could put Montana industries and Montana workers at a disadvantage, depending on what the rest of the nation is doing. Climate change is a global issue, let's not put Montanans at disadvantage when it really won't benefit the overall picture much. Let's not limit ourselves to sequestration for carbon capture and storage. I think finding a way to re-use the captured CO2 is much better. Let's encourage those technologies.

Every CO2 emitter should have a carbon capture plan! I am not ready to support eminent domain for pipelines.

Sure 0.5 is a small number right? BS, we're talking huge volumes! Bet the farmers & ranchers really will enjoy "eminent domain" provisions. Get real - not in Montana! Take this proposal back to California 7 Missoula.

if this is done, it must make sure businesses don't shut down and move out of state

NO. NO. NO.

DEQ is often helped to much by industry to write its regulations. I want overseeing in writing regulations for the good of the whole not just the industry. Eminent domain for pipelines I completely oppose. We have been ripped off by greedy industries in the west and we now need responsible people willing to consider the environmental concerns of a bioregion before they are allowed to do anything in that area. Water, air and food are more important to the survival of our species than any profit for any one corporation.

We should move away from any coal technology and invest in wind and solar.

I like the idea of incentives, but not the requirement.

Excellent idea.....this should just be a standard overhead cost of doing business.....not enough money in the industrial sector? Then I would remind the questionnaire of Exxon's '06 profits in excess of 30 billion.

I agree with the eminent domain component.

We do need to require the rules for limiting carbon output but Carbon Sequestration is not the answer.

Coal is a poisonous resource that should be left in the ground.

This sounds too expensive. This would put montana companies and coal development at a definate disadvantage to their competition.

I like the incentive idea, however I am against giving the DEQ this carte blanche power.

I was OK with this one until it got to establishing eminent domain for CO2 pipelines. Planning for those pipelines is at least premature, and may turn out to be preposterous.

raise taxes and tie the hands of the energy producers

Plans no, actions yes

"Government is not the solution to our problems, it IS the problem"

You've got to control mercury and other pollutants in addition to CO2!

Fossil fuels are not the answer, and "bio"diesel does not burn cleanly. Biodiesel is also dirty to manufacture and corn requires petroleum based fertilizers.

Unsure of implications.

Again, Carbon does not need capturing. What's next, "di-hydrogen monoxide" is a poison?

I'll support this when there is a safe and economic, proven technology in place. Not putting it in the ground.

This is currently unachievable!! where's the technology to reduce CO2 emissions without breaking the bank. Don't try to force technology through emission standards; you'll be sorry you did when we don't have any affordable electricity.!!! Wait for technology to develop.

Use of eminent domain for CO2 pipelines may be needed, but do not favor DEQ writing rules to govern industries. Montana still needs to work on being competitive.

MWH & BACT used here for the first time with no definition.

I am concerned about the potential dangers of CO2 sequestration that might fail, releasing high levels of CO2. Couldn't that be locally fatal?

Pay attention to the fact that controlling CO2 will have no appreciable effect on the Greenhouse Effect. Use of Eminent Domain for any of this nonsense would be a travesty.

So far from what I have seen these types of plans only allows the traditional fossil fuel corporations to maintain their control and their cash flow and continue the threats forward to future generations.

Incentives are always taxes spent. NO on eminent domain!!! Especially for a unproven need or technology!

Emphasis should be on renewables

Some industry will be unable to control CO2 emissions. What do you do with the CO2?

Could increase consumer costs and implies mandatory targets.

We need to move to renewable energy sources!

sure, if we can fix this, coal can be part of the solution.

Until it can be proven that CO2 is a problem, and that we are not looking at normal climate variation, this would be a great waste of money.

While we approve of the use of incentives, this recommendation contains hard targets that will lead to increased costs to consumers.

Many questions here.

Carbon sequestration and especially reuse is a viable option in the industry context and needs to be pursued vigorously.

I am skeptical about the prospects for carbon sequestration and wonder if this would not be a wasted effort.

This still seems like to much of gamble and very expensive while safe, proven, more affordable options are already available without the controversy. Nobody is worried about what will happen with a wind turbine.

This is nothing more than a Sovereign State placing itself in a prostate position at the feet of our National government; thus assisting the "white House" to be renamed the "White Castle" of the United States.

Does the CO2 limit apply to humans when we breath out? Will we need to get a permit to have children,. since these are new carbon producing units? I like the eminent domain for CO2 pipelines, though. This scheme must have been developed by PT Barnham. Are you kidding me? We can reduce our carbon in Montana if the politicians and you d people who came up with this drivel quit talking.

The State does not need to make regulations to control an imaginary problem.

Coal gasification is the only thing I would support.

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.

No more DEQ authority and not more eminent domain.

Consumer pay

TheDEQ should not be allowed to write rules without consent of the State Legislature.

Ridiculous. Concerns over CO2 are ridiculous

Please! Incentives? From the government? Have you paid attention to Cuba lately?

NO MORE COAL! NO!!!

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING IS BASED ON JUNK SCIENCE. PLEASE DO THE RESEARCH AND DON'T STEAL FROM THE PUBLIC THAT YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT!

any incentives for fossil fuel use only prolongs our dependency and takes funding away from renewable and perpetual sources.

Who sets the standards and are they possible with the technology available?

I agree with this concept, but have a big problem with eminent domain. Too often it is used for the furtherance of a corporation's ability to make exhorbitant profit, rather than public necessity.

Horrible question! Hydrogen production and carbon capture have nothing to do with each other.

No to the eminent domain.

You are attacking private property rights here. We have more than enough restriction.

Eminent domain?? Tread lightly here.

We need to look at cradle-to-grave impact of every product made. Everything should be required to be recycled in some manner.

By when? PIPELINES CARRYING CO2 WHERE?

CO2 is not polution, nor will capturing it will make it rain more during the Summer in Montana. Will drive jobs and industry to China.

Again--- too technical for the average Montanan to understand. And I have a Ph.D. I have concerns about expanding eminent domain law to accommodate carbon dioxide without specific knowledge of the language which would protect the landowner. Another possible component of this recommendation could be the establishment of the ownership of the geologic formation where the carbon would be sequestered. I believe the Wyoming legislature is addressing that concern now.

CO2 should be managed as a pollutant which the federal government has already stated.

It would be nice to find a use for the carbon, hopefully a scientist will do that.

Too technical -- don't understand it. WHO THE HECK WROTE THIS SURVEY? There are companies and writers who know how to take technical information and make it accessible to layman. You very obviously did not do this. I CONSIDER IT A SIGN OF DISRESPECT FOR THE PEOPLE YOU SUPPOSEDLY SERVE.

Allow landowners to request an annual compensation for the use of their land especially when state eminent domain laws are used to sequester CO2 from sources that supply out of state markets. Provide a mechanism that will allow Montana citizens the ability to sue for damages caused by leaking pipelines and sequestration sites, geologic instability caused by deep CO2 storage.

Our number one research priority should be on power production that results in zero greenhouse gas emissions, not going back to fossil fuels.

DEQ is not elected officials and they should not write the rules without tax payers approval. it's unconstitutional.

Eminent domain for CO2 pipelines should be in place but it would be a big mistake to adopt rules so restrictive that industries would be reluctant to put forth proposals.

No rules without good publicity and voting opportunities

Opposed to "require"

Eminent Domain should not be used for pumping CO2 until sequestration can be proven. Will areas for sequestration also be through eminent domain?

Excellent.

I agree with incentives for advanced fossil fuel generation, but feel carbon capture and storage production may consume more energy, producing more carbon than it eventually captures

While we approve of the use of incentives, this recommendation contains hard targets that will lead to increased costs to consumers.

Best available control? Why not wait until larger states come up with something?

This assumes that CO2 is a pollutant...HOAX!!

Only if 100% of the carbon is captured. otherwise the CO2 problem continues to worsen.

I would rather put efforts toward biomass, wind, solar energy.

Again, I rank this as a reserved 4 based on the left column. However, the suggested "requirements" could be onerous.

I do not agree that bureaucrats should be given authority to write rules of such major impact. I do agree with enabling eminent domain for pipelines to carry CO₂.

Total boondoggle proposal high cost with no proven benefits.

We should be putting our energies into developing "greener" energy technologies such as wind, solar and geothermal energy rather than using fossil fuels. We should be phasing out the use of coal as soon as we can.

DON'T WASTE OUR MONEY ON FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS. IT IS THE WRONG WAY TO GO!

Depends how it is done. I can see ways that this would be a waste if done to prevent any practical development but if the actual impact would set a workable framework then it could be good.

Avoid fossil fuels in the first place.

This is total inefficient beurocracy.

eminent domain it a sore point for many property owners, so many times they are forced to give up property that does not always seem fair.

The very existence of vast hydrocarbon deposits is proof that the earth's biological and geological processes are capable of sequestering excess Carbon dioxide without human intervention.

any infringement on property rights will be met with a BIG lawsuit lasting years and costing millions.

Stop allowing new generation plants without CO₂ sequestration, while bringing the old ones into compliance with new regs to sequester CO₂.

cannot comment on this item based on what I know at present and certainly do not have the time nor the interest in trying to get myself up to speed on this question

The state should not subsidise or otherwise provide incentives to the private sector. This has a market-distorting effect and by favouring existing technologies, this policy would delay the onset of new technologies.

Landowners have the final say of their property, not a utility or a mandate from govt.

Again, if "carbon sequestration" refers to burying it in the ground, I am against it as well as to encroach on private property to transport and bury it.

Let's stop looking backwards to the old dirty technology of fossil fuels and keep them in the earth where they will be most useful for staving off global climate change.

Oppose eminent domain.

I am 100% against anything that will encourage so-called "clean coal" or encourage further development of any fossil fuels (thus, continued reliance on fossil fuels). I believe the solution lies mostly in incentives for and research on REDUCING our reliance on energy in the first place. FIRST conservation, SECOND use renewable energy sources and only as a last resort -- in desperate times -- fossil fuels. I know this is an extreme point of view, but I truly believe that if the marketplace and the government gets behind conservation efforts !!) - then the people will follow -- and that for the energy we do still require, if renewable energy sources were readily available, affordable and understandable -- in fact, de rigeur -- that people will embrace these technologies. Let's just say goodbye to our addiction to fossil fuels!

I DON'T REALLY THINK THIS IS IN ANY WAY FINANCIALLY POSSIBLE !!! AND IF SO, WHAT ABOUT METHANE GAS. THE REAL ENVIRO ENEMY ???

Doubt that we can do this, and think that alternative energy development should be our focus.

We have the technical expertise to write appropriate rules.

GNP expects that federal legislation to regulate GHG emissions will be passed in the near future and we are developing our business plans accordingly. In the meantime, we believe it would be ill-advised for Montana to adopt GHG emissions regulations in advance of federal legislation. Any regional or Montana-specific regulations would have an infinitesimal impact on global climate change. "Early adoption" of regulations would impose significant costs on Montana businesses and consumers and would send an anti-business message to energy developers driving new projects and related investment to neighboring energy-producing states such as Wyoming and North Dakota.

there is enough out there now, deal with what we have rather than creating more and more regs.

MT needs to watch national agenda on this objective. We will hamstring our industry if surrounding states are not moving on this issue concurrently. Focus on technology development to accomplish this goal - implementation will follow.

While we should support development of new technology and the deployment of that technology, we should not have a state agency mandating plans by rule.

The pipelines will be necessary and we do need to be able to place them. Incentives are probably needed as well. However, I am concerned about the rules requiring plans...these cannot be so much stricter than in other states that we drive the industry elsewhere. The coal is here. We need to develop it.

As a Biologist I am not convinced that carbon sequestration is the right way to go. If we don't extract the carbon from the earth in the first place it is much less likely to be a problem in the long run.

with teeth behind the rules

I don't really know what this is.

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

yes, for existing coal plants, but we should not expand coal development.

We need incentives now, and legislation ON A NATIONAL LEVEL when it is developed. No specific state rules or DEQ authority.

Again, the goal should be reducing fossil fuel use altogether not finding ways to sequester carbon emissions.

Unsure about the pipeline ?

The emissions controls are important, but there are so many more important things in which to invest than continuing to prop up coal and other fossil fuels. If we want to get into hydrogen as a fuel, finite and polluting fossil fuels should not be its source.

I'd be ok with this as long as the "rules" don't outpace technology!!!

Would this be cost and energy efficient?

likely very costly, costs to be born by the consumer.

Prefer eminent domain to be used only as last resort with no encroachment on wildlife runs and open space.

I have concerns about the cost and effectiveness of large scale geologic carbon sequestration. If money is to be spent, I would rather see it go toward more cost effective, predictable methods. This concern applies to all legislative efforts to focus on carbon sequestration.

I am sure that MDEQ has the in house expertise to develop comprehensive and meaningful regulations for CO2 when the EPA has been working on it for a least a year and has not put anything out there. Maybe we should hire the EPA to work for MDEQ.

Carbon capture will add costs to the generation of electricity putting us at a regional disadvantage. Montana should instead follow Federal guidelines.

These technologies (pipelines that would carry CO2) are unrealistic, do not reflect actual technology, and too far into the future to be any use. It should not be a priority.

Need much more information. It is important that Montana not get too far ahead of the rest of the country. Regulations unique to Montana are not likely to attract investment, but rather the reverse. Montana should look for ways to provide regulatory certainty and incentives for advanced fuel technologies, including CCS.

It is not clear what this level would represent. The energy use of capturing, compressing and transporting CO2 must be considered more openly before public agencies prioritize public resources to support these endeavors.

Okay, but rather than building new pipelines for sequestration, I would rather see energy production limit the CO2 output in the first place.

Carbon sequestration may be too costly for consumers to bear the cost. Furthermore CS technology is still unproven.