RCII-9 Comments
Recommendation 9
Carbon tax

A carbon tax must be based on scientifically defensible calculations of the real cost of using each fuel, and then flattening the true costs of fuels. Offset released emissions with taxes.

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.

How about a tax on estimated carbon tax by vehicle type. If you own a vehicle that burns more carbon they should pay more in taxes.

This is the best incentive that we have at present.

Follow national efforts, don't try to lead them.

I do support a tax on unnecessary use of electricity like electronic signs.

Carbon tax is a new tax and should not be imposed. This will result in higher production costs and the costs will be passed on to consumers.

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.

How do you tax or give tax credit for a naturally occuring substance?

The carbon tax system as in use overseas has not worked. I don't think we need to duplicate failure.

This is critical both for industry stability, investment, and planning; and for mitigating climate change.

We'll need an easy way to measure things at the local level.

Consider economic impact on trying to control global warming that mankind has no control over.

Although an onerous option to many, past history shows us that free market approaches do not necessarily result in products and services which promote enlightened social, economic and environmental pathways. We need to go on a carbon diet; but most people don't choose diets willingly.

Just start setting an example, set legislation to be progressive not digressive.

Another excuse to tax.

I understand the importance of a unified process as pollution knows no boundaries. However, progress will happen only when there are leaders. Be careful of letting industry supported Washington DC politicians control the pace of progress on a topic that will not wait. Join California and other states in the lead - make DC get in step.

Let the feds handle this.

How many way do we already tax ourselves and businesses? Does this grow the economy or stifle it?

Leave the free market alone.

A carbon tax bases its allowance on a entity to emit a ton of carbon dioxide under a cap-and-trade. Are you going to apply this to the trasportation sector as well?

The current proposals on the federal and state level are still 10 to 15 years out for carbon capture and sequestration. So what does Montana do in the meantime?

Carbon tax-great idea! Coal burning powerplants recieve healthy profits from a cheap dirty fuel. They invest very, very little in the future. There is no impetus to look foward with new ideas.

How 'bout we just all stop exhaling!

I am unclear as to how this would be implemented. It seems regressive in nature in that the poor would pay a dispproportionate % of their disposable income on carbon related espenses.

YES, to a carbon tax.

Incentives are better than taxes - forget it!

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

No new taxes!

This should be coupled with elimination of payroll tax/income tax to help small business and offset increased cost of non-renewable carbon-based energy.

bullshit!!!

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. This one is PURE bullshit, that does nothing but make folks feel better about wasting resources.

What national efforts? Montana needs to create its own.

I'm not sure that a tax will be as effective as strict carbon rules. This also gives the idea that some carbon is allowable and that the rich have more of a right to use and pollute our resources than the poor.

Make polluters pay.

I support if current pitfalls and loopholes regarding carbon offset credits, etc. can be mended.

We already have a carbon tax. It is the ever-growing cost of energy.

thank of another way to steal money

...need to establish a goal here. ...or at least a target date for having some measurable goal.
Drives inflation while accomplishing nothing. A better idea would be a "baby" or newborn tax to encourage population reduction, which would inturn reduce demand on natural and other resources.

Absolutely. This will help 1) discourage wasteful usesage of fossil fuels, and 2) pay for the incentives to increase efficiency and renewable energy development. There is a way to do this tax in ways that do not impact farmers and ranchers, that lessen the blow to rural areas, and that gradually increase so that citizens have adequate time to take advantage of programs to increase efficiency while adjusting lifestyles.

I absolutely do not support such a ridicules tax. Scientific studies show that humans are only responsible for a very small portion of Carbon Emissions, much of it occurs naturally.

Besides that, it is absurd to punish people for simply living. I will never support any such "Carbon Tax", and I am in favor of lowering taxes in general, along with less government spending.

It is time to NOT subsidize the coal/oil industry and give these funds to renewable: It would be nice to have industry pay their fair share for a change instead of paying off the politicans

As a retired Meteorologist with a Master's degree in Meteorology I know that CO2 is not a major cause of warming. CO2 only makes up 0.04% of the atmosphere and CO2 form burning fossil fuel makes up only 0.001% not enough to have any influence on atmospheric temperature. The sun is the only sourece of heat. Clouds and water vapor trap 98 percent of all the long wave radiation trapped by the atmosphere. CO2 traps only 1 to 2 percent. In fact, CO2 only absorbs in 2 percent of the infrared spectrum. We are currently in a warm period simmilar to the Medieval warm period. Anything we do will have NO effect on the climate but could have a devastating effect on our economy.

This is based on the erroneous assumption that we are the prime cause of global warming-reference Avery and Singer on the web.

We should develop our own standards and implement them.

This is another attempt by corporate greed heads to get out of being responsible for the environmental messes and financial social injustice that their pursuit of the god almighty profit causes.

Ideally, I would like to see our state exceeding national standards, as they seem to be lower than I would like and lower than the standards supported by the rest of the developed world.

We shouldn't simply follow - we should LEAD This is the Treasure state, and our current, VERY saleable treasure is clean air, unspoiled vista's, and minimal pollution.

A carbon tax will drive up the cost of energy for everyone. This hurts our global competitiveness and will hurt jobs. We should be discussing ways to reduce the costs of energy.

Leave taxation to the Feds -- or at least guarantee that every cent collected goes directly to subsidize consumer-sited generation. In short, any additional demand taxation should subsidize demand reduction, not producer profits/compliance with new standards. MT simply has no "market" (only a monopoly) for gas and electricity supply. Rasciot's "deregulation" folly has clearly demonstrated this.

the government should not tax anything.

Flow thru cost to ratepayers.

This would be applicable if the national efforts are substantial. It the national effort is pathetic i.e. inadequate, there is no point in following it.

not sure this is politically tenable. Plus we need the CAP

This is the direction we should go in order to fund programs and incentives and slightly discourage consumption.

not sure I completely understand the program. I am strongely against companies being able to trade carbon credits

No basis on which to set a tax. No cost benefit analysis available.
Contrary to what the report states, utilities would pass on ALL costs to consumers. Utility costs are high enough.

My concern here is that many businesses lease buildings owned by others, and may have no control over how the buildings are designed. Ditto for residential renters. The renters and leasers would end up paying the additional tax in increased rent, and the owners of the buildings would not have an incentive to increase the energy-efficiency of the buildings.

If you have no goals identified, how do you know when you get there.

I like the idea - it would help to know what the goals would be.

There is no Scientific evidence supporting CO-2 and it's greenhouse impact.....please read the historical data and the truly scientific facts.

imperative to define state-based goals and incorporate into conservation programs and allow carbon credits as an 'in kind' source for some of grant funding matches for federal and or state dollars

I prefer legislation that rewards rather than punishes.

It is good to work with other countries.

Very important!!!

Use of coal ought to be limited as much as possible.

I support a national carbon tax, or a cap and trade system. But implementing such programs on only the state level could backfire by pushing polluters to other states and actually blunting the momentum for developing renewables here.

This is extremely expensive and will not achieve it's intended purposes. Giant scam on public and businesses.

Not very adventursome. This is the sort of stick that will replace mega expenditures on consumer eduation.

I strongly support a carbon tax/BTU tax, however... I do not (necessarily) support a rise in tax revenues. A carbon tax should be mostly offset...

Feds lead on this.

Someone has to pay the tax and that will be the end user. How much is this ulitmately going to cost versus the unknown benefits to be acheived.

We already have a tought time growing our tax base.
Carbon tax will not work in the long run. Consider the laws of physics before suggesting this kind of foolishness.

This seems like the fairest method of achieving the needed change while working within the framework of market forces. I think this is perhaps the most effective means of achieving the desired ends; also provides a means of paying for any incentives.

There is no scientific concensus to support carbon tax issues. 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.

Carbon tax would be a new tax and I am opposed to any new tax. Additionally, this tax would add to the cost of energy and many manufactured products.

THIS IS AN OPEN DOOR FOR FRAUD AND OTHER ABUSE BY WELL PLACED AND POWERFUL POLITICIANS AND CORPORATE EXECS.

Strongly support if coupled with tax relief for low income demographic.

Now we're getting somewhere. The stress on the pocket book changes behavior.

Goals should be identified. The word "possibly" should be removed.

A carbon tax or cap and trade system is inevitable--we should prepare for and embrace this when it comes.

No. This will increase power costs to the consumer with little or no effect on global weather.

Absolutely Not - this is a distortion of true market forces

Use the money to educate citizens about energy effeciency

I don't like the carbon offsets idea as it seems impossible to monitor.

Pure Hogwash. Just another way to tax us!

We do not need any more tax

Increase the cost to consumers, ruin Montana's ability to mine coal, good grief! NO

I doubt if the federal government will pass satisfactory standards.

Over 50% of the US electricity comes from Coal. There is not techology to take the CO2 out of the gas as promised by enviromental groups. Where will our electric generation needs come from in the immediate future? Renewables such as wind can not be counted on to provide firm power. With "todays" technology firm power can only be provided by Nuculear, Natural Gas, Hydro, and Coal. What will be the cost to the consumer of this Tax? Has it be communicated to the public?

This is absolute folly. The idea that CO2 is a major cause of global climate change is junk science. And furthermore, anthropogenic CO2 accounts for only 0.12% of earth's total greenhouse effect. This is insignificant! If you wiped man off the face of the planet tomorrow it would not make a measureable difference in climate change.

what does this mean?

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

Not possibly--but definitely.

another tax, and with no goals identified, is NOT a viable solution to anything.

The Carbon Tax is nothing more then a ponzi-scheme based on bad science. The Carbon Tax is particularly damaging to the poor who cannot afford new cars with lower emissions, etc.
the keyota treaty was never passed into law. stop pushing it threw the back door

As if we don't have enough taxes.

Absolutely. Montana should lead the way on this issue.

This is inevitable. Montana can either lead the debate and join with other states as laboratories for democracy or we can let the feds shove something down our throat.

don't really know anything about this

Hell no!

This is just ridiculous!!

Will this decrease Carbon emmisions or start a game of people selling carbon credits? Great if it decreases emmisions!

To be blunt, this is ridiculous. There is NO evidence that Global Warming is man caused. NONE! 30 years ago the scientists were saying we were going to have another ICE age and were selling ice cube taxes!

Worst idea since the Inquisition!

CO2 causing global warming is a joke. Historically co2 levels rose on average 800 years after temperatures rose. CO2 does not cause global warming. Besides, increased CO2 actually causes an increase in plant growth...biology 101.

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

http://www.rightalk.com/asx/ggws.asxThe above video destroys the myth of human caused global warming. Get informed. The truth shall make you free.

This will only serve to drive energy prices higher than its already outrageously high prices.

NO NEW TAXES

Absolutely No

Ridiculous.Soon we will have Global cooling. CO2 is good for agriculture.

No more taxes to fund your foolish ideas, we already have enough laws governing environmental protection, this is just another way to pay for unnecessary spending

Any time we open pandoras box in taxing our ability to create jobs and produce energy, we lose.

Since when has Montana followed the "national trends" in determining state policy.
This is the typical response of a liberal, socialist based report, lets tax it! Again taxes are not paid by the corporations, they are just collected from the consumer and passed up to the government, who then takes a bite of it in the process of sending is back to those they wish to influence and hold power over.

Bogus idea, feel good legislation. Does nothing to solve any real problems. Allows the major polluters to feel good throwing money at something besides the issue. Administrative nightmare and huge bureaucracy builder creating false positives without addressing the issue or fixing issues within reach and are doable.

Another tax to line politicians pockets.

Just another tax that would line the pockets of politicians and never provide for improvement of air quality or land improvement.

LOUSY idea. I am adamantly opposed to any kind of carbon tax that serves to strip the taxpayer of more wealth and give it to big business (who issues and owns carbon tax credits?). PLEASE be responsible and do not join such a ridiculous campaign.

NO NO NO NO NO!!!! Carbon Tax = Redistribution of Wealth in the guise of environmental friendliness = World Socialism.

Any tax would be passed on to the consumer; especially egregious to low income folks.

Montanans should not be followers. I see Boston Tea party in this.

If you want to reduce carbon with no tax, have people get rid of their pets! Think of how much energy goes into making pet food and transporting it across the country. Talk about something leaving a "carbon footprint!"

Though I fully support this tax, I think it is crucial that any tax legislation compels industry to pay the carbon tax as well as individual consumers.

this is so expensive no one could afford it. Plus how are we going to tax the ocean, where most of the CO2 comes from?

And how do you plan on taxing the ocean, where most of the world's CO2 comes from.

Need to understand more about real efficacy of the whole carbon credit/carbon tax thing.

This is crazy. If you set a standard and then allow high emmiting business to buy carbon tax credits it makes me wonder if it is really about the emmisions or if it really is about money. What we are saying is it is okay to have high emmisions as long as you have enough money. what a joke

SS If done this should be at the federal level for a small number of projects until see how it effects the overall balance of that particular industry

Not only no but hell no.

Carbon taxes have been proven to be ineffective in other countries. They simply drive up the cost of doing business for carbon producers, who then pass the cost on to consumers.

carbon tax is the way to go... not cap and trade.

If done this should be at the federal level for a small number of projects until see how it effects the overall balance of that particular industry.

I do not see any reason for another tax

A carbon tax for just Montana would be another example of were this State it shooting itself in the foot. Carbon control needs to happen at a Federal level so it is a level playing field for all states. A cap and trade system is a better process to reduce carbon.

Just another TAX,this is rediculus,this will turn us into another high taxed SOCIALIST Country!

We have enough taxes already. These costs will only be passed on the the consumer. There are better ways to address climate change in a cost-effective manner. If this is chosen, let's keep it on a national basis. That makes more sense than Montana having their own program. It should also apply to all sectors.

One cannot make a blanket statement in this regard until you know what the national standards are. Of course, we need to be involved!

This an international question which will require an international solution

We should be looking for and drilling for more oil and gas, not putting our head in the sand and acting like green energy can replace it. Wake up before Hugo Chavez owns Montana.

BS. Carbon Tax will be passed on to consumers. National Efforts are from the ecoterrorists & Californians (same thing really).

No, energy is over taxed too much as it is

This is the most important part of creating effective action on carbon emissions. This will support and incentivise all of the other actions proposed. BC is the first to do this in N. America, Montana should be the second!

First, the targets and timetables must be sufficient to do what the science demands in both the near and long terms to reduce the negative impacts of climate change to the maximum extent possible. This will require reductions in total emissions on the order of 80 percent by 2050 and 20 percent by 2020.
Next, permits to emit carbon must be used for public benefit, not private windfalls. Pollution allowances are a public trust. All allowances should be auctioned or otherwise used to benefit the public, not to generate windfall profits for polluting industries. Free allocations, if any, must be limited in size and restricted to a short transition period.
Revenue raised by the bill should be used to promote a clean energy future by investing in the highest-value solutions for emissions reductions first. These funds should not be used to perpetuate dirty, expensive, outdated technologies like coal and nuclear energy. Allowances and auction revenues should be used to accelerate deployment of the clean energy.

Any "carbon credit" moneys spent go directly to Al Gore as he owns the corperation that the money goes to. He has more than enough money and this is just a bad idea.

Do not support carbon taxes, offsets or credits. Reduce carbon output!!!
I support Carbon taxing only under a country wide cap and trade setup. Country wide cap and trade allow for the most cost effective carbon reduction to the consumer. Straight taxation or state/regional cap and trade would penalize Montana consumers. Carbon is a global problem and should be addressed federally. Any efforts that Montana puts forth that are above and beyond our Federal efforts will only result in Montanan's footing the bill for a small environmental improvement that we won't fully benefit from.

Excellent idea!!!!!!!!
Make the power hogs pay for their opulence/community impact.
I only wish I could support the Carbon Tax more than I do already. We as citizens have grown too used to being too comfortable with round-the-clock heat and air conditioning, etc. We do not need to be in a 70 degree room, while sleeping under covers.

if done, it has to be done nationally. Enforcement/compliance can be delegated to the state DEQ, however.

Got to hold people accountable for their actions.

We need funding for research/implementing alternative energy practices.

If national efforts are not there, we need to do this here in Montana as well. There needs to be set goals defined and we can help lead the nation to move towards a carbon tax.

A combination of a carbon tax with a cap and trade system would cover more ground and both have a positive side that can be capitalized on.

Who pays the tax? The customers will more money out of my pocket.

probably won't work...and if it was enacted who pays...the consumer and small business.
If it is already national, why the redundancy?

Like carbon trading, a carbon tax is not sufficient in itself, but will be vital if combined with other steps.

con games, scams

HELL NO!!!!

Until the US creates a national cap and trade system, Montana should certainly participate fully in the Western Regional Climate Action Initiative. Putting a price on carbon, which a tax would esstentially do, people will begin to associate the actual "costs" of greenhouse gas emissions

This seems to be a very difficult and nuanced program--and should not just be levied for carbon but for all GHG producing gasses, in relation to their relative radiative forcing. Nitrogen based fertilizer would have to be taxed, as well as biodiesel. Done right, it could work well. Done poorly, disastrous results could follow.

This idea is soo crazy it does not deserve comment.

Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant. As such, there is no valid scientific reason to reduce carbon usage through taxation.There is no valid causal link between carbon dioxide and variations in temperature. Thus, provide empirical data that proves the causal link between human produced carbon dioxide and temperature variations BEFORE passing laws to tax carbon.

Hell no. Carbon is an element, not a problem. If it wasn't for Carbon, we wouldn't be here.

no support for such a program

Why is tax always the first solution the govt. places on industry and public. Need to find better solutions than taxes.

Tax families those that have more then two children. $1000 per child beyond two. Inforce imigration laws. Reduce demand reduces carbon generation by reducing growth.

need to identify specific goals

No carbon tax!!! A cap and trade program is preferrable.

Not enough pure scientific evidence on Global Warming to support taxation for carbon emissions.

The whip doesn't tend to do so well in MT. We should only follow national efforts.

Montana is a large carbon "sink", however, CO2 gas in the atmosphere is an essential part of the atmosphere. There is inconclusive evidence that the current level of CO2 is harmful or that increased levels are causing harm. Furthermore, 70% of CO2 gas comes from nature, we can only effect about 30%, and CO2 gas accounts for only about 10% of atmospheric warming at best, so even if we reduce output (of CO2) by humans 100%, we will only effect 3% of the temperature change. This in fact, not conjecture.

What a bunch of California democrats. I'm ashamed to be a neighbor with you nancy boys.

We should at least follow the national efforts, if not help raise the national standards by our actions....let's be a leader and a role model.

A carbon tax seems most effective, but must be nationally applied. Preferably, internationally.

Yes. Plum Creek needs to pay, but who do they pay? They should pay me and my family, along with every other family in the Flathead Valley, because we have to breathe the air.

This is a crock!

Please see an editorial written by John Baden about carbon tax vs. carbon offsets. Carbon taxes are much better than carbon offsets. He states that "offsets" are like indulgences given by the Catholic Church in the 1500's. People could buy an "offset"w/out changing their behavior. http://www.free-eco.org/articleDisplay.php?id=561

ABSOLUTELY NOT. Nothing could be more harmful to Montana Business and jumping on the National Bandwagon of deception and misinformation is NOT where Montana wants to be.

If another country threatened the United States and our way of life, we would react with harsh and rapid penalities. Yet,when our own fossil fuel corporations and chemical corporations continue to threaten not only our way of life but other peoples of the world lives as well and we hesitate to take action? We are addicted!

Urgently needed

Another tax on private citizens.

Have a goal before you can begin to talk on a issue and again look at all sides

This is absolutely necessary to hold those most responsible most accountable!

A carbon tax would add to the price of products and energy. Let's not make new taxes on an already over-taxed society.

Carbon taxes are nothing more than a political ploy and should not be enacted by ANY level of government.

Yes: tax, not trading

We need to establish fines and penalties for those that consume more than they are entitiled. Provide for efforts to develop technology for more efficient use of energy in industry. Using methane gas from landfills to power industry, etc.

Scientific theories on global warming do not warrant new taxes. Need additional analysis to understand impact on consumers and penalties on business development.

This country has spent over 200 B$ on a futile war! the cost of providing all the United States electrical needs with renewable energy is estimated now at about 200 B $ (wind/solar) - Let's spend 200 B $ on renewable energy as a national priority it should be!

Do more than the national effort

A carbon tax is the best way to encourage clean energy

A tax that, like other corporate taxes, will ultimately be paid by consumers.

This is where the rubber hits the road! This is realy what all this is about, a way to tax the citizens of this state for a ficticious climate problem that does not exist.

It is hard to determine the extent of the impact to consumers and needs more analysis.

This could provide the most effective incentive to reduce GHG emissions.

This is the simplest most effective way of creating a disincentive to pollute at all levels of the population. The proceeds can be returned to taxpayers in the form of a equal rebate that as a result puts the heaviest burden on the biggest polluters, typically the wealthiest top few percent and industries, making the tax progressive and a powerful tool for reducing emissions. Or the taxes could be put back into renewables or increasing efficiency in other areas that would reduce costs to consumers and prevent an increase in the longterm tax burden on the majority of citizens.

Another TAX! It was once stated the "the power to tax is the power to destroy." No truer words were ever spoken. When will government learn that 'what works in one State may not work in another.'

Please, this is the biggest scam there is, just another way to tax people.

This is based on Junk Science. Instead of holding your finger in the air to see which way the wind is blowing try to inform yourselves on all the information that is available that debunks this myth.

This is a sheel game that will only reduce the effeciency of our economy. It means nothing other than redistribution of wealth

This whole "carbon" issue is based on imagination and would just be another tax to correct an imaginary issue.

If carbon emissions are made economically inefficient, commercial effort to reduce emissions could be increased.

NO NEW TAXES!!!!!!!!!!!!

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.

If we are to have a future, this needs to happen soon!

There is no justification for a carbon tax. I would like to know how much a carbon tax will cost consumers and business and what will the tax be used for.

Only if it is nation wide

Once again, an attack on production. Gore and the other elitist demos want us to pay for our footprint. Well, I have an idea about where to put my foot.

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING IS BASED ON JUNK SCIENCE.
You can fool some of the people some of the time, but this time, you can't fool us anymore.

ABSOLUTELY ILLEGAL!

These effots are focused on the transfer of money and provide just a "feel good" emotion which does not affect the stated overall goal, to my knowledge.

If you like $100 oil, you'll love a carbon tax. The economic downturn we're experiencing now is nothing compared to fuel cost increases from a carbon tax.

Having to pay such a tax will increase the publics attention and possibly care of global warming and its consequences.

And use the revenue to finance non-carbon energy production, preferably owned by the co-ops, local governments or the BPA.

Absolutely not. This is no more than a way for certain people to cash in on a theory.

100% against it!!

Three pronged approach should include tax on pollution as you have here - as well as incentives to conserve and recycle.

Incentives rather than disincentives always work better. Isn't there a better way to deal with this issue?

Maybe??? this would have to be looked at more closely.

Tax the poor's electricity and give to the rich? Doesn't make sense to me.

Don't know what a carbon tax is -- how about explaining some of your terms?
Support a good national/international cap and trade program instead. It has enough "legs" to get off the ground being more of a carrot approach rather than a stick approach.

Excellent and very important idea.

Why? Carbon is an element. I suppose you're referring to carbon dioxide emissions. The logistics required in Montana for survival would mean less coming in, less going out & cold winters, even inside of building because we wouldn't be able to heat them. Why don't we just cut our throats now.

carbon tax is a fraud. For a lot of money and work right now the benefit will be 1 degree less global warming over 150 years! totally STUPID! Carbon tax credits are a fraud!

I think that this is just a way to avoid developing pollution reduction processes.

A stupid idea!!!

Should be decided on federal level just like any cap and trade program. Any new tax will be passed on to consumers.

No way!

This will force more manufacturers out of the state. If you want to be like California then move there and run for office.

You have no goals yet you want to slap a tax on something? You've got to be kidding.

Set time frame.

I strongly support this solution.

It is hard to determine the extent of the impact to consumers and needs more analysis.

What part of Hell No don't you understand?

carbon taxes allow the rich to pollute

Concept of "carbon tax" is based on the hoax of man-caused climate change...concept is not based on science.

A carbon tax can only do so much. We need major reductions form all sources.

I believe poor leadership and dishonest motivations are behind "Man Caused" global warming theories. There is enough evidence to show that it is a flawed assumption that warrants a very cautious aproach to any government involvement. And further taxation/inflation will only be damaging.

Too many open ends here, cannot support. This is an invitation to the law of unintended consequences running unchecked. Even with all the political rhetoric, to the U.S. Senate's credit, even that body voted 98-0 (I think two were absent), to not proceed with Kyoto Protocol.

I disagree, as does the National Association of Counties.

Looking at this issue from an economic perspective is very important, as economics got us where we are and is perpetuating the problem.
This proposal is totally unecessary for reasons stated in the first recommendation above. The bureacracy, paperwork and montitoring for this outlandish proposal is even more staggering, possible eaquivilent to the costs of all the previous proposals. It would destroy not only Montana's economy but also our quality of life.

As I understand the carbon tax, it will hit hardest the farmers and truckers who must use a lot of fuel to do their essential work.

NO MORE TAXES!!!

totally arbitrary as to what national efforts would be supported and whether they are the most effective for long term goals.

Much of the change that will happen will be because it is financially beneficial to us indivdually.

Montana does not have to follow along with the socialist/communist global warming hoax.

NO weaseling out with trading of carbon credits

discrempency of a fad. Is carbon heavier than air? GHG says it is but carbon credit pundits say you can capture it in the soil for credits. Duplicity in this case is not feasable.

This may not be the best way to go but for now we should climb aboard the carbon tax wagon.

Why pay for the carbon tax fraud? CO2 is a life giving gas. Why tax it? I know folks are uninformed, but dont fall for this fraud.

Again, examine the proposed City of Portland, OR carbon tax incentives and disincentive ordinance as an example of what major municipalities and state can/should consider

There are subtleties here that must be thought out in that no matter who you tax, the end user ends up picking up the tab. If the tax money is used for the expressed purpose of increasing conservation and efficiency (with the effect of lowering overall energy use and thus reducing carbon production), then a tax could be viewed as a positive step.

I support this if it is really a tax. If it is a means to allow polluters and heavy users just to pay more and keep business as usual, then I do not support it.

Educate public on pros and cons of each approach

Excuses industry from necesssary change.

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.

Huge potential impact no benefit

Follow national standards AT MINIMUM. We can do better. CA for example

The Federal Government needs to figure out where it is going on this issue - it can't be done at the state level.

This needs to be done at the national level

This tax is so unfair to people in rural and northern states that I cannot believe we would support it at all, let alone be the "front runner". There are long distances between places in this state, it is cold and dark much of the year. No matter how much you tax the fuel, the towns will not get any closer to one another, and we will still need to turn on lights and heat our homes. We will pay a disproportionate share of these taxes.

Yes, but it feels like the cap and trade system which I am extremely wary of...

Tax receipts need to pay for impacts on high-carbon energy workers and low-income people, also help subsidise alternative energy research and development.

I need to understand this better

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

What a scream. This whole concept is a myth. More nanny state the sky is falling. Get real

No tax, cap and trade, worked for Acid Rain SOx reduction, will work for CO2. do not go alone on CO2 regulation and drive out the last bit of industry we have left in the state. This must be a national program.

Holcim does not support a carbon tax. Holcim fully embraces an appropriately-designed cap-and-trade scheme as the most effective (from both a cost and environmental perspective) market-based mechanism to address climate change.

Define some goals.

do what is best and cheapest for Montana(the coal industry provides excellent wages in a state 2nd to the lowest in the nation. Montana needs to develop its coal . It can be done cleanly

Not enough information. Does this mean polluters will be taxed (heavily I hope) for the amount of carbon emissions over a certain limit?

Insufficient information.

Suggest you refer to the hundreds of PHD scientists who believe the case for severe and adverse climate change from carbon has been overblown. http://www.oism.org/pproject/s33p36.htm
One key part of the ipcc case, that AGW caused more severe hurricanes, has been thoroughly debunked this year. Turns out warming causes FEWER and WEAKER hurricanes. Too much BS in the Al Gore case, like his preposterous claim that those opposed to his theories amount to a flat earth society, or are "in denial". CO2 levels were 20 times higher than today in the early Paleozoic, and yet the Ordovician saw a major ice age. CO2 often does correlate with temperature, but the best evidence is that CO2 rises FOLLOW warming, instead of causing or leading warming. As the oceans warm up, they can hold less CO2. The actual effect of CO2 on warming is best described as moderate. There is a gross lack of geologic perspective on the entire AGW issue. For example, Jim Hansen says that one more degree of warming would be a disaster.

Montana must do better than the nation. The current national admin. sucks.

I don't see the political will to get this off the ground anytime soon.

This one does have a basis, but make the tax transparent. Everyone needs to know that they are paying part of the bill. Each gas station should have a sign that says of the price of gas ??? is a carbon tax. On your energy bill it should say, here is amount allocated to the carbon tax.

We agree that a state-based CO2 tax is not appropriate and would place Montana business at a competetive disadvantage.

I think this is especially important with square footage over a designated amount such as 5,000 sq. ft. This is adequate for any size family and anything above this is a drain on the system. Aspen, Co does a similar carbon tax.

The wording of this item seems very weak, with many qualifiers. I would encourage a stronger stance. If there is a carbon tax at a national level, Montana WILL support it.