

RCII-12 Comments
Recommendation 12
State lead by example

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.

Each of these ideas will cost tax dollars to implement. Renewable energy is expensive. These three points are all inflationary in nature.

How about more simple things like changing out light bulbs, turning off computers, eliminating lighted signs???

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.

These suggestions all sound expensive, and are bound to raise taxes. Ask people for donations and see how many care enough about these issues to put their money where their mouth is.

Absolutely. We need to set an example in Helena.

Lead by example.

County Lead by Example program may also be appropriate.

The State can and should set the example

Train your workers, anticipate transition from fossil fuels to renewables. They are afraid of the change and its uncertainties for them. Renewables will require more workers stay in local communities and not in centralized facilities such as Colstrip. More electricians putting up wind generators and solar panels on homes.

The legislature should take this bull by the horns and fund it fully!

strongly support all but the "carbon offset" provision - this is disingenuous way to "reduce" carbon footprint!

Run away from this as fast as possible. It is absurd. Montana has no market power. Let's not forget the premise upon which this proposal is based.

When we dispose of florescent lighting bulbs, where do all the internally contained elements go? Does this cause more environmental pollution? What is the net benefit between soil contamination and greenhouse gases?

Make government buildings the examples for private sector, thereby reducing cost of government.

The goals set by this survey are impossible to meet. There is no way the transmission system could support the kind of suggested renewables. I would rather see obtainable goals.

Renewable energy systems must be cost effective and the building must be energy efficient before the alternative energy system is added. All cost effective shell measures and equipment efficiencies should be incorporated first. You can always make the building ready for the installation of an alternative energy system and when they become cost effective they can be added.

Long overdue

This will simply make the cost of government go up.

25%...no. As a state we should be purchasing and INVESTING in power from renewable energy at a much higher percentage by 2025.

We MUST lead by example!

But I do not support large-scale industrial-style corporate wind farms and their accompanying transmission lines!

Government should certainly lead by example. We should set a high percentage of green energy that government must use, to help create a market for green energy.

Yes the State of Montana should lead by example.

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

Are we going to spend \$5.00 to save \$1.00? Will a detailed cost benefit analysis be performed to make sure these are sound business decisions? An expanded state buildings program? Where does this money come from? General fund appropriation=more tax dollars.

I strongly support requiring new state buildings to be built to high energy-efficiency standards. As buildings are renovated, emphasize energy-efficiency, but maintain an appropriate cost-benefit ratio.

The state should not purchase higher cost energy so it can feel good about itself. The state must be fiscally responsible to the taxpayers first.

I believe it would be a better use of state time and money to more actively promote Arbor Day, encouraging citizens, schools and municipalities to plant trees, rather than mandate carbon offsets.

pipedreams

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. What IS 'green' power? I'd bet we already do this with all the hydro in Montana.

Yes! I think the state should be an example for people to follow.

I support if there are a number of state buildings - I would need to see an analysis of benefit - money better spent here or towards more inefficient non-gov't buildings?

again where's the money

Good! This recognizes that new buildings have opportunities for efficiency that are not practical to retrofit into old buildings.

Other states are implementing these changes.

All state building should follow LEED rating system.

<http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CMSPageID=222>

This example is more unnecessary use of our tax dollars.

Especially "Carbon offsets" which are a stupid practice that accomplishes nothing, nor is it needed. So-called "global warming" is a natural cycle which is effected very little by man. We do not need to waste money for a false cause, here in Montana or anywhere else for that matter.

Yes!

You have it half right. Leeds certification on new state buildings, and renovations are good ideas, as long as the cost is responsible for the taxpayers. Percentages of power from renewables are unattainable at that rate without high user costs. Again, we need to develop our coal resources without extreme regulations to force the ending of the use of it.

Don't forget the solar orientation.

As in past comments, I wish the standards were higher, but if that's the best we can do, I'll support it. But I think we should always have the option to increase the standards as time goes by.

New state buildings should be built with high energy-efficiency standards to the extent that they are still fiscally reasonable. The only motivation for using high-efficiency standards should be to save money over the long run.

Requiring green power has already driven up the cost of electricity in Montana, especially due to the increased amounts of firming power that utilities must purchase to supplement wind power. Green power should only be mandated for state government if it is cost neutral - and it appears that it will not be cost neutral for some time.

Requiring carbon neutral bonding is a terrible idea and an affront to the taxpayers. Too often government entities exempt themselves from the requirements they put on others. Leading by example is key to public buy-in. Govt regulation not as important as direct incentivizing of real changes - e.g. California.

government building should always lead the pack, then others will follow, albeit without incentives.

Simply directing state employees to reduce energy usage by 20% without providing monies by which to do so is unrealistic. Further, it seems arbitrary, in that some buildings may already be energy efficient to some degree, making the 20% reduction goal all the more unrealistic.

This would be a good start.

Mandatory third party verification of energy efficiency is a requirement. Many buildings and building programs claim energy efficiency, however do not specifically verify the efficiency. Anyone or anything can claim to be efficient, but a third party rating system (LEED type program) should be a requirement. Only if it can be shown that each step can be accomplished without corresponding cost increases.

Why isn't the state already doing this, instead of spending our taxes on other unnecessary things

Excellent! Putting \$ where one's mouth is lets Montanans know that government shall lead by example.

Restricting the state to purchase a percentage and all the combined rules will COST the Montana Citizen thru taxes.

Need to include buildings that are rented by the state.
CO2 is not a problem, don't spend money until the issue is fully understood.

Requiring renewable energy purchase (which is far more expensive than fossil fuel) to offset a phantom problem is a waste.

Another bad idea that will drive up the cost of construction. It is difficult to get renewable energy projects sited and permitted. Carbon offsets are a joke and do nothing to improve the environment.

Hard to do, I know. I work for the state and know that there is a huge problem there. But maybe a handle can be grabbed and held on to. I was involved directly with the state procurement of recycled product and it is status quo now. That can happen again with progressive people involved.

I would give this a 5 but for the last item which would require carbon neutral bonding for state bonds. Has the state adopted an executive or legislative position on carbon??

all but the carbon offset portion acceptable

Making energy efficient improvements to state buildings is a good idea, however energy mandates must be done using a reasonableness standard (benefits versus replacing a more expensive renewable for a less expensive one - wind for hydro)
The state can set a great example and help make a market for energy efficiency in Montana.

Anything we can do to save tax payers money by increasing govt efficiency, I support.

I doubt that this is practical in the time frame given. At least now without huge tax increases.

There is no scientific consensus to support carbon tax issues or investing in CO2 reduction. Recent reports analyzing historical data clearly show that climate drives CO2 rather than the reverse. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

These proposals add to the cost of state government because the cost of energy will be higher. I am interested in some credible information on how many years it will take for savings to equal the cost.

ONLY IF STANDARDS ARE FEASIBLE AND AFFORDABLE AND SUFFICIENT RENEWABLE ENERGY AT A REASONABLE PRICE ISW AVAILABLE.

I believe the federal government should take the lead with purchasing electrical hybrid and hydrogen fueled vehicles. No reason why the states can't fill in the void in the meantime.

Also, require state buildings to be located in downtown areas to minimize employee driving distances.
Good ideas.

The state shouldn't waste a cent of my tax money on inefficient buildings.

I do not subscribe to carbon offsets as a way to reduce greenhouse gases. It simply shifts to another producing it. Simply is a way for some broker to make money on the carbon credit exchanges. Ultimately will not produce a reduction.

Taking each building on its own merits - what is the cost/benefit??? Not some pie-in-the-sky percentage - we need to deal realistically

This sounds expensive, and I am already getting nervous about costs. New buildings seem possible, but all existing State buildings?? By these times? And carbon offsets??

Also require state buildings to be located within established walking/biking paths. Ride the trolley!

again more cost to the people more government NO NO

Start now and provide example buildings.

How much is this going to cost the poor, average, property tax owner? I see much of this coming down the pipeline to increase cost to the average consumer. We are tapped out!!! Why don't we require something on the end of the insurance premiums too. Government is killing the middle class. I sincerely hope you do some serious thinking about the trickle down on all of this. I'm all about slowing global warming, I was doing research in the 80's this isn't new news. I can't stress it enough, trace the problem back to the problem makers, who will also be the hugely wealthy, who are also right now the law makers in this country. I highly doubt we will successfully make them accountable for this misery we will all endure in the coming years, 10% and 20% is a drop in the bucket! Get your visor cap and hang on, this is a very bitter pill and fossil fuel is largely to blame. Make all the little drop in the bucket attempts you want to help remedy but if you really want action then get serious and create legisl

What will be the cost to the tax payers for this program?

Sounds like a very large increase in my tax bill in the works here. Again, the whole carbon neutral junk science issue at work. None of these projects should proceed without a complete cost/benefit analysis before hand.

Yes, the state of Montana needs to lead by example!!

While I agree we should build our state buildings to higher energy efficiency standards, I can't agree with the other 2 mandates.

Taxpayers get to pay for energy efficiency experiments. Make these "goals", not mandates.

State buildings today are built with very good standards.

The state should always do what is most economically sound for the money they have available first and foremost.

Increasing the cost of bond-funded projects via carbon-neutral bonding requirements is not economically sound.

keyota was never ratified and what would this do to the cost of a home.

Yet more tax burdens unauthorized by the constitution.

The South Dakota legislature is on the verge of passing a high-efficiency state bills. Legislation by Rep. Van Dyk from the last legislative session, which was killed by the House committee. That was unfortunate. In Republican South Dakota, both parties can agree on this. Montana should pass this.

while renovating, be aware how much material is heading to the landfill. some of this can be reused, this aspect is just as critical.

No. This requires additional cost for all State infrastructure. I would support this if the Administration pares down other Governmental costs.

Who is going to pay for all this?? Where is the "green power" going to come from? Why are energy efficient products so much more expensive than others? Again, the cart before the horse. I, as a taxpayer, don't want to pay for this unless it will save money in the future and I don't think it will.

Lets purchase %50 or more from renewable!Montana can lead the way!

Citizens are looking to our government for leadership - by example and by establishing regulations that are then enforced. There is no downside to conserving energy and to using renewable sources. There are possible economic benefits in the creation of jobs and of economies (as in the case of biofuels). Current jobs can be migrated to new ones needed. In addition we should absolutely not be investing in new infrastructure for fossil fuels - which will only tie us to their use in the future.

Do NOT pay for this stupidity with our taxes!

Since it can be demonstrated that carbon is incidental to climate change and NOT the driver, the carbon-neutral part is unacceptable.

Let the market dictate the construction of state buildings. The state should be building fewer buildings - not more! Carbon offsets are a joke. We need more CO2 in the atmosphere to increase plant growth. No proof the CO2 influences global temperature.

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

This is one of those multiple choice options that I could support some concepts but not all

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

Issue of carbon offsets is not prudent.

Where is the money for all this renovation going to come from? What will be a qualifier for "renewable energy?" This will strangle hold Montana, especially because we don't produce "renewable energy" here.

The state of Montana can set an example for energy consumption. As we see our government continually growing, the offsets that are mentioned in RCII-12 will be consumed by more bigger buildings used by more local, state and federal government.

First carbon offset do not reduce carbon output if that is the goal, it only shift the burden, now the country who bought the carbon offset has to do what we could not. How realistic is that. This will produce a "One world government" where there is not sovereignty of nations and the currency will be "carbon offsets" Just the cost of doing business in the state with the rise cost of fuels will, if the governor and legislature is serious about saving taxpayers dollar "which I doubt", should necessitate these changes to save the taxpayers money and to better use the tax dollars to help people and govern the state.

Strongly opposed to "require carbon neutral bonding for state bonds. This would kill the state bond programs and would be exclusionary in nature. It would force participation in carbon offsets programs and will do nothing to genuinely improve the environment. The best way to sequester carbon is in young actively growing trees. This would imply that we should be clearcutting old growth and lodgepole pine stands to make room for those carbon sequestering young trees that will come back. Also if you genuinely wanted to reduce carbon release you would be logging, requiring the feds to log, and prescribed burning would be illegal given the amount of tons of carbon released from this wasteful practice. So until I see a major participation surge from state government (Governor) in the management of federal lands in our state that demands logging and management of our federal lands and resources, all of this can be viewed as "feel good" politics that screens the real issues and provides no tangible solution to ANY of A cost to tax payers that would have no measurable results.

Human carbon emissions are not the cause of global warming, but rather an effect of the earth's natural warming cycle. PLEASE do not buy into the carbon credit lunacy.

The State should already be doing innovative things to improve efficiency. Why should there be a "mandate"? Simply a feel good recommendation..

Again, the cost comes out of my pockets and we are already taxed to poverty levels as is.

Who will pay the bill?

I don't think that I can even comment on this without knowing the cost of doing it. It always seems like a good idea until as a tax payer we get the bill.

This is something that was done in the 70's and should be done again. May even save taxpayers enough money to fund some of the other programs that were suggested above

New construction and remodels are already being built to higher energy standards. Would the state purchase "green energy" no matter the cost? How much more will it cost to purchase high efficiency goods?

Again raise the goals more faster

This is something that was done in the 70's and should be done again. May even save taxpayers enough money to fund some of the other programs that were suggested above.

I do not believe in socialism. Move out of America if you do.

There is no reasonable proof that the product (renewable energy) will be available in a reliable amount and affordable price.

This seems like a political ploy to make someone look good when in reality, what difference will it make, besides increasing the cost of government. Making buildings more energy efficient is OK, but the rest of this recommendation is not good.

I like the idea of tax incentives, but is outlining a specific percentage reduction economically possible? We don't want to wreck our economy by setting artificial and unrealistic goals.

Again let's promote energy efficiency without penalizing coal fired power plants

Good idea except for the carbon neutral bonding

Don't do this if it is not cost-effective. Tax payers are not giving you an open checkbook to do "feel good" "look at me" projects.

Standards are unlikely to be based on cost benefit basis. Instead, hysteria will reign and ridiculous non-beneficial standards are likely.

How are you going to pay for this. Is the cost savings going to off set the cost of renovation

Again I am not happy with ramrodding anything without complete scrutiny of project. There is a lot of phoney green advertisement out there right now. Government is not immune from producing and promoting waste. We need all changes don't well and correctly.

Why would you want to pad Al Gores pocket at the tax payers expense. Again, this is just a bad idea and nothing more than just a "bill of goods" designed to get into people's pockets a little deeper.

Do not support carbon taxes, offsets or credits. Reduce carbon output!!!

My only concern here is the question of the availability of renewable energy in Montana.

Excellent idea as should be the case with the feds too.

A great way to set an example.

All of this is going in the right direction but can't we get there a little faster?! 2020 and 2025?!

The state should also mandate a use of 70-100% recycled content for all in house office paper use. Localized purchase of all food items available that are served within state government systems. This should also include the school systems.

This is okay as long as my taxes don't go up.

in 12 years 40%? be lucky to achieve 10%

I like the idea of green power purchase. However, where are you going to get it? I sure don't see you pushing wind farms. Every one wants them, but no one wants to look at them. Hipocrosy. The only true "green" power that we have in this state in any kind of abundance is hydroelectric, and many want the dams removed to improve native trout habitat. I just don't get it.

So far, everything I have read here would create new jobs---another good thing, raise taxes and pay off con gamers like Al Gore.

All this legislation is based on a hoax and junk science in order to hike taxes and the price of energy. Try to tell the whole northern tier of the US, who've had record snowfall and cold this year, about 'global warming'...HA!

the state needs to help with building more renewable energy, such as wind power through tax incentives.

Leading by example means LEADING BY EXAMPLE. Ramp it up a notch.

State buildings must be built to minimize initial cost and operating cost. You don't drive up cost to realize minimal power savings that will never be recouped.

In favor as long as taxes and cost of govt. are not increased.

State government should be in the forefront; however, this should not increase the cost of state govt or increase taxes!!

An absolute must do!

YES, I agree totally. The state and federal agencies should be setting the prime example of the way that these things should be done. Do as I say not as I do does not work here, we must lead by example.

Ever consider green roofs on public buildings? Chicago is doing a fabulous job, and many other cities are utilizing this method to reduce heating and air conditioning costs, as well as mitigating runoff.

Don't use tax money to buy carbon off-sets. Too many of these are scams and/or of short duration benefits.

Purchase a certain percentage of energy for state government use from green power. Let's make that a large percentage.

We can't afford this.

May be too high - above possibility. (RPS?)

Changes such as these should only be pursued if they have an economically sound ROI.

Where would the funding come from? Seems that we have a hard time just taking care of the States highway systems!

Very unclear. Sounds like something coming out of California.

Spend. Even if the power is much more expensive?

Very forward thinking ideas! Green power should be purchased as often as possible.

While I do not think the Government should control what we can buy, I do think they need to lead by example rather than by regulation.

I would like to see a comprehensive cost breakdown of how much this would cost state taxpayers before any cost savings were realized.

Need to look at installing wind generation energy capabilities for State facilities such as Section houses, rest areas, etc. Need to make our hydroelectric facilities in MT more efficient. At one time these probably would have provided much of the power in MT.

Need to understand impact on government budgets and thus taxpayers.

we have a moral responsibility to lead by example.

Instead of wasting taxpayer dollars on art for newly constructed state buildings, why not require renewable energy investment instead? At least over time it might save taxpayer money.

Is this a JOKE! You can't actually think that this made up "chicken Little" hypothesis of global warming requires such drastic measures.

While we support conservation efforts and efficiencies it is impossible to determine the costs involved in this recommendation. We also believe that work environments need to be comfortable and healthy for employees. It has been shown in the past the design does not take into consideration human behavior; for example, there are many instances where individual work spaces have area heaters to make the work environment healthy and comfortable. While they may have been an intent to design the space efficiently, those efficiencies are lost based on individual behavior.

We could do better than this, and nuclear energy should be part of the solution as well as renewable energy sources.

If the government isn't doing it why should anybody else?

The phrase "State lead by example" does nothing more than encourage people to reorganize. . The majority of Legislators do nothing more than follow orders. The old saying, "if you want to make it here ... don't make waves!" The phrase "Lead by example" would soon produce a State full of human robots.

Again more government regulation raises the costs with little or no payback.

I believe that employees should play a large part in energy use reduction. They need a reason to be more responsible to conserve the various types of energy, be it natural gas, electricity, gasoline, whatever.

Carbon offsets is a hoax-forget that. There is nothing wrong with the State purchasing wind power electricity-but does not need to be mandated by law All buildings be energy-efficient, but not at the expense of the health of the people in them as is now the case most of the time.

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bull**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.

Green energy is typically more expensive. State government should be purchasing the lowest cost energy available so taxpayer are not paying any more than absolutely necessary.

Can all this be done without costing more than is saved?

Great. More government workers to watch each other.

Many need to see these programs can and will work.

Can't support carbon neutral bonding

The bigger the government - the Less the Freedoms people have.

What effects would this have on state coal mining? We need to use our vast coal reserves in a responsible way instead of locking them up. The governor has some great ideas on this.

lot of place can't afford this

Manipulating the market and no analysis of the cost and who pays it.

define "carbon offsets" because I would be against allowing entities to place more carbon in the atmosphere just because they can afford to do so financially.

This is something the state can do to reduce energy consumption, but it must be cost effective.

Again the goals are a way too low.

Where is the money going to come from.

you had me until you required carbon neutral bonding. Lets jsut be reasonalbe. Save where we can, but not keep businesses from coming here or expanding. If it's good for Montana economics, we should do it anyway.

Great!

RPS?

good idea here, I think.

Money better spent on roads and schools.

There was already an initiative DEFEATED to keep the state out of the power business.

I'm dead set against the carbon credit idea. It's rife with unproven science, scair tactics based on false science and corruption in the implementation. Sure more effecient buildings would help but the carbon tax credit idea just steals money from tax payers for meeger benefits.

Construct no more new state buildings.

Again, I do not think that carbon offsets is the way to go.

Not affordable.

Admirable goals but bonding provision may result in not receiving best return.

I would change the purchase of power from renewable energy not included in an RPS to 50% or generate the power by 2015.

Reduce time frame.

especially support and provide jobs with renewables Keep taling about Carbor offset.

While we support conservation efforts and efficiencies it is impossible to determine the costs involved in this recommendation. We also believe that work environments need to be comfortable and healthy for employees. It has been shown in the past the design does not take into consideration human behavior; for example, there are many instances where individual work spaces have area heaters to make the work environment healthy and comfortable. While they may have been an intent to design the space efficiently, those efficiencies are lost based on individual behavior.

ONLY and ONLY if the improvements or the construction standards meet present-value calculations over the life of the buildings. No showboating, no bullshit.

reducing energy use is a noble and necessary goal, but costs could raise taxes.

Carbon offsets are a hoax.

Too many points for one answer...costs could be outrageously high, promotion is based on the global warming premise and not sound conservation and business practices, state revenue is already stretched, cost benefit analysis is needed.(Unless it is in the final report, which I can not pull up.)

This must be shown that the above proposals are cost effective over the life of the buildings and not just a feel-good movement. Taxpayers will have to foot the bill, so prove to us it can be done without increases in taxes.

These arbitrary "feel good" mandates would likely cost way more than any projected energy savings.

There is a point of unreasonableness which you must avoid.

Hydro power should count as renewable energy. Neither wind nor solar are 100% productive at all times.

Provide incentives for solar panels and make best use of both solar and wind energy opportunities around the state in both residential and industrial applications

Absolutely state buildings should be built to high efficiency standards without a bunch of energy wasting design for aesthetics only. The purchase of renewable should have a cost cap so that non cost effective renewables do not get funded taking from other societal needs.

This is all government bureaucracy.

State officials could drive smaller and more efficient vehicles and probably drive less and car pool more.

We don't want to go to overboard and waste money. There has to be a balance

currently most power already comes from green hydro power. Too much % reductions. Figures on current usage are off.

Absolutely

Definitely the state needs to lead and advertise what they are doing!

The State needs to get its power from sources that are affordable. It doesn't matter where from. Don't fall for the carbon fraud.

Laudable goal. Begin with the new state buildings. Go slowly on existing due to high cost benefit return.

Again, I am very much for energy-efficiency.

Green Building and LEED has become the industry standard for most of the nations leading for-profit investors and lenders because of the return on investment. State and local government should 1) immediately start a building commissioning and energy consumption benchmarking programs for all public buildings; 2) develop energy performance contracting protocols for all public facilities and encourage ESCOs-Energy Service Companies to become involved in retrofits and renovation financing. Despite the enormous up-front investment, such a policy will have a quick return on investment, saving taxpayer dollars, and significantly reduce carbon emissions. This activity could be a good use of coal tax revenues and/or future carbon tax revenues. Both provide almost immediate taxpayer returns (5-10 years) and significant long term benefits for future generations.

Conservation should always be number one on the list of priorities, even before purchasing "green" energy

Keep public informed of progress in meeting goals including details of what works.

SOUNDS GOOD---HOPE ITS NOT ANOTHER "FEEL GOOD" SUGGESTION---

Good example from the State.

If government leads, the people will follow. People are waiting for credible sponsorship. They do not want to go out and make costly mistakes just trying to "do good." If given the information, they will act.

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

renewables costly and inefficient

too expensive to implement

Great!

This is a feel good objective, but could be effective if the state is going to take a leadership role on efficiency improvements.

I believe the state has done many things to improve energy efficiency. The focus should be on supporting the continuation of those efforts.

If it makes financial sense (with a balance sheet of numbers) then the state should take steps to conserve energy and lower costs to taxpayers. If we are going to pay more for "green energy" so that we can feel good about ourselves, I would rather not.

Start this program in the State Capital.

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

This will cost the Montana taxpayers untold millions of runaway government spending on feel good "green" policies.

I like the idea except the carbon credit purchase. CCX credits are hogwash and dreamt up to provide additional income to farmers or gov't who already do those things to begin with

Purchase 100% power from renewable energy by 2025.

Holcim supports the State's efforts to demonstrate leadership by moving toward a stock of high-efficiency buildings and energy-efficient operations.

Too many topics in the question.

would want greater than 25% from renewable

Not enough, not soon enough.

way expensive.

Good, but not being implemented fast enough.
Too broad of a topic

Over all, why wait ten years, why not 6?

What will taxpayers have to pay for this?

Nothing is wrong with energy efficiency. But requiring the state to buy green power seems more geared to support an uneconomic green power industry.

need more information. Estimate of costs to state government for purchasing any amount of "green power"?

The state should look to save taxpayer dollars with reduced costs as far into the future as possible, at least 20 to 30 years or more. It is appropriate for the state to invest in local, renewable energy.