

TLU-9 Comments
Recommendation 34
Procurement of efficient fleet vehicles

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

And, there should be more requirements for carpooling in fleet vehicles. There are too many state employees that are utilizing giant SUVs and they are often alone or do not need such a vehicle. There should be more hybrids.

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.

What do you mean by energy efficient?

Start at home - educate by example.

The goal should be for 100% of the state fleet to be energy efficient.

The objective should be overall efficiency.

Remove the subsidies that encourage bad behavior, and the state fleet will become efficient through the free market.

Strongly favor

As older vehicles are processed out of the system.

"energy efficient" - what does this even mean?

Why not 100%?

Yes, Absolutely! again, Lead by example.

Hybrids or efficient diesel (e.g. VW) would be nice.

Good idea for us tax payers buying the fuel!

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

Are we talking hundreds of snow plow trucks, and other light duty pick-ups at DOT? Sounds like quite an increase in their new vehicle budget. How much? More general fund and taxes. What's the cost benefit ratio? Efficiency is a relative measure. Vehicles should be efficient to their purpose and purchasing decisions should always be made with efficiency in mind.

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.

Duh... Does government want to save money?

Goals *with incentives/mandates to back them up* are good.

Of course!!!

Why not make 100% the goal? Don't equivocate.

the state needs to be purchasing the best mileage vehicles (ie Prius) regardless of where they are manufactured and the cost of the vehicle.

Unnecessary regulation.

The state has a chance to make a real impact with the kind of vehicle it purchases and uses. I completely support this.

Define energy efficient. Consider if vehicles are lighter, they are more likely to be totaled by a deer or a trip into a guard rail on an icy road. How efficient is that?

absolutely unacceptable to do anything less.

Good idea as long as it does not place an inordinate burden on the taxpayers.

states should leave the charge, but leave decisions outside of government vehicles up to the individual.

The goal for all vehicles should be 100%

set the standard!

Absolutely.

What is the cost impact?

By...when? Eventually, 100%?

Maybe

Define "energy efficient"?

Railroads are much less polluting and more efficient.

This should be done anyway as a matter of policy-it does not ake special legislation.

Good idea--if you can make this work economicly and have trucks that can actually do the work they are supposed to do.

nice thoughts but an unrealistic goal

You buy what is available don't you?

Also hybrid school busses!

Why not 100%?

this is too nebulous

more than that!

Larger less energy efficient vehicles could carry more passengers as a way to up their efficiency.

Lead by example.

Why Not 100% ??

Incentives not Mandates.

Fine as long as they do not cost more than an "inefficient" vehicle, and the old vehicles are only replaced when they are worn out.

I certainly agree that state government should purchase vehicles which have the lowest long term cost to the citizens of Montana.

By what date?

If this requirement applies to future vehicles and the cost benefit of increased vehicle cost versus lower operating costs is a net-positive, then this makes sense. Typically, however, these kinds of policies result in an over-all increased cost to the state.

sounds good ,but were does the money come from. you can only tax the private sector so much, after all the private sector pay for the government sector and on average they make more money then we do.

Saves taxpayers money.

should show some cost benefit besides making the extreemest feel better, and require no tax increases to pay for it

Many departments order larger then needed vehicles, that should be checked as well. I see SUVs with departments that never leave town....in Billings the streets are cleared enough to get anywhere with an average vehicle. Give classes on winter driving.

Depends on the total cost Will the fuel savings exceed the additional purchase and replacement costs?

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

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

Cost of converting the fleet must be looked at carefully. also it is important to insure that the intended use of these vehicles is not compromised.

that is Okay in the replacement of equipment if you can do that an save the tax payer money on procurement and operating expense, but it is going to cost more overall to the taxpayer, forget it. It just occurred to me, if at \$3.00/gallon for gas, do we need a committee report to recommend this. That would be the natural thing for most households in Montana, when it need replacing upgraded etc. we will get one that is more fuel efficient.

This can be done in layers as old vehicles need to be replaced.

By attrition only. Unless some politician wants to buy a spoty car to drive delinquent teenagers around in.

depends on what the cost is. money and power

BY WHEN AND AT WHAT COST???????

State could lead by example, where practical

I thought we were doing this as much as possible now. If we aren't shame on the administration. If you want to save on GHG why are there 3-5 state pickups on every construction site in the summer. When interim committees meet nearly every attendee drives alone.

Set a specific high standard.... 50 mpg,etc.

State could lead by example, where practical

It depends on the cost savings, if any. I don't want my tax dollars spent unless it makes a real difference.

Seems like this will result in a increased cost to the taxpayers without much benefit to climate change.

Need to keep in mind the purpose of a vehicle, so that it can perform the task of either hauling freight, or to get people to work

Important for state govt. to lead by example and to create a market for new clean technologies.

Or even better... hybrids.

Why not 100% of all new vehicles purchased for a start.

As long as my taxes don't go up.

This is important not just from the perspective of global warming, but also the fact that as China and India continue to grow gas prices are going to continue to rise.

Why not all?

tax breaks for the rich

Why only 70%?

Good policy.

Vehicles must serve their intended purpose. Energy efficiency is a cost-benefit-return on investment decision.

Good idea.

I'm not sure what energy efficient means in your world right now. A bike?

Here you go use the market to change the market!

Yes, we must do it. The fleet turns over anyway, replace those vehicles with better ones. Again, lead by example.

This is a feel-good proposal. As taxpayers, we expect a cost-benefit comparison of the costs of the vehicles combined with the costs of the appropriate fuels over the life of the vehicle owned by the state, to the vehicles purchased to date.

Once again, these decisions and policies should be implemented because they are economically sound NOT because they fall in line with some environmental program.

Set up standards that will escalate over a set amount of years taking advantages of newly developing and evolving technologies.

Okay if taxpayers aren't paying.

By when and at what cost?

Again, you can choose to lead by example not regulation. You will find it almost impossible to achieve such goals for your own fleet. How much will it cost taxpayers for your fleet to be "green"?

Should be voluntary.

Don't think they exist yet - but when big oil gets out of the way - this would be good!

What do you mean by fuel effecient. You have not given us a number so I can't comment.

Detailed analysis should be undertaken to ensure this is cost effective from all aspects, not just fuel economy.

Good idea, but I don't think 70% of heavy duty vehicles can be energy efficient. Good luck!

Any company owner does this now. But when a person is just starting out he cannot afford such a vehicle; not until he has saved up enough money This idea is nothing more than to put the ownership of the trucking industry into the hands of the very wealthy.

Are the State officials going to give up their "big" cars in order to comply with this.

Would never pay for itself

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.

By When? \$

Optional. An economy measure only

With this one I have very personal experience. The Montana state vehicles don't work so you have to use some rednecks 4000 horsepower truck. Just drill more wells.

NANNY STATE PLUS BIG BROTHER GOVERNMENT = 1984

Let the people who actually pay for their vehicles make those decisions. The government is notorious for wasting tax payer time and money. There is a reason people say "take your time, its a government job." Get some of the wasted spending in line then take that money to go green.

Who bears the cost? Are more taxes necessary to pay the increased costs?

This would set a precedent for non-government fleets, etc.

Would come naturally without government pushing it.

By what date?

By when?

good.

This is a great goal (though perhaps too lofty) as long as legislators and motor pool operators keep in mind certain agencies and programs still need high ground clearance vehicles to get off the well traveled roads to get their work done. There could well be a premium to pay for such vehicles and the motor pool will have to specify rigs that may not be as cheap to own or lease as is the current plan.

GREAT !!!!!

Shouldn't the state already be looking at vehicles with a balanced approach that weighs economics, efficiency, initial cost & maintenance?

They tried it in Glacier national park going to the sun road. 300,000 for a stupid bus that runs 6 months of the year?

Not cost effective and as taxpayers, we expect these vehicles and the fuel used to be cost effective. We also expect efficient management as with any other business. This proposal does not meet those expectations.

This could probably be accomplished in state fleet, but could be a problem for state to utilize pick-ups.

Add by 2010.

Electric would be best!

Overall costs would be too high. Phase it in instead.

By what time frame?

The state should lead by example

Detailed analysis should be undertaken to ensure this is cost effective from all aspects, not just fuel economy.

Only if NET COST PRESENT VALUE VIABLE.

What would be the target date for this goal?

Energy efficient = 40MPG or greater. This technology already exists. Let's get with it!

I don't believe that this policy would be cost effective in the long run. As a taxpayer, I am more interested in the least cost to the states.

This one is somewhat reasonable, but certainly isn't anything beyond common sense given price of fuel.

and cap speeds at 65

It would be even more efficient to eliminate a lot of state employees, so we would not need such a big fleet of vehicles for them.

not realistic or feasible

we have tried to pass this legislation in previous sessions, please let's support these types of protocols

THOUGHT THIS IS AN EXISTING BUDGET GOAL FROM AN ALREADY FINANCIAL STANDPOINT!!!

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

OK, if done efficiently otherwise the state will just be pouring taxpayer money down the drain.

Good goal. How is energy efficient defined and cost to the taxpayer?

If it's cost affective

Only if cost of such vehicles are equal to or lower than existing budgets.

A mandate without specific direction is the bane of taxpayers everywhere.

100% of each category to be energy efficient.

Holcim supports the State's efforts to collaborate with EPA's SmartWay Program.

Eventually it has to be 100% by year 2010. the gov. is going to have to give financial incentives.

Is there a timeframe set for meeting these goals? None is mentioned here.

again, encouragement goes farther

We need to look into this but I believe this is a little premature. We cannot forget about the economic impact this could to taxpayers in the state.

Do we have to replace them before their useful life has ended just to be more energy efficient?

Fleets have a unique opportunity to utilize the benefits in this area.

Lead by example and create the market. Work with other states to influence the manufacturers' fleet pricing structures.