CC-3 Comments
Recommendation 52
State GHG registry

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

trading emissions? How does this work? I refuse to reduce my emissions but if I can trade somethning for it I am a good guy? Does anybody even think about what they are suggesting?

Don't get ahead of the line. Wait and see what the Feds propose and work with that.

What will this cost and who is going to pay for this?

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.

Should not be implemented at the level of a single state.

Existing programs of this nature are suspect. I would want to make sure we got what we were promised.

Just work at this locally. Be an example. Just start doing it. We're all in it together. Spend the money on infrastructure and training workers to transition to renewable energy and to becoming efficient in building and ways to be self-sufficient/efficient in energy

Leadership by example

This is getting redundant.

This makes me feel good. We take responsibility for some other state's carbon production.

Seems as if these already should be reported under current programs.

Bad idea that is needed for the interim. We have to STOP our unfettered use of carbon based fuels.

And what? - Sing kumbaya?

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

I think it's premature to suggest legislation for something that does not exist yet.

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.

Very important

I don't like emission trading programs.

You are on the wrong track.

Inter-state cooperation is OK. Non-affiliated, independent study is just stupid.

good idea, but should not be legislated.

Let's just lower emissions! B/c MT doesn't have much industry and a low population densit, we should be able to financially benefit from these trading schemes. However, in the long run, it is in everyone's best interests to invest in reduced emissions and wise energy production/consumption, rather than playing poker with our ecosystem health!

Emissions trading does not work. Emission Caps might.

Any emissions trading program must be federally implemented.

Shows we're serious.

work with other states, don't spend time reinventing the wheel!!

No emissions trading. Everyone needs to pollute less.

Could be very economical for Montana in the future.

Emissions trading is a scam-how does it help air quality.

emissions trading is a crock of feces

Also critical.

This implies a one-size-fits-all model. Such is not the case.

Studies show that there is zero climate benefit to investing in GHG reduction infrastructure and monitoring. Clearly there is no concensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

A place to start.

Garbage

WITH THIS LEGISLATION THERE WILL BE NO FUTURE AGAIN LOOK AT THE COST TO WE THE PEOPLE

Should be national if at all.

This is just another program to make more millions for Al Gore.

This is called "fooling yourself".

Again, promotion of bad science.

keyota was never ratified

This is a key component for all other legislation.

this is the really big joke paying and trading carbon.
This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. No trading or taxes. Montana's poor and middle class cannot pay any more for energy.

http://www.rightalk.com/asx/ggws.asx

Take care of the people and renewable natural resrouces here in Montana

Now this is a novel idea. Let see how does that work, we get money for our unused carbon credits so some other part of the country can have dirty air, water. but let face it with the Montana winds, the carbon credit we sold to California will blow in here next week. and we will have dirty air also. Or is trading emissions is another way of making us feel good while doing nothing.

This is ridiculous. Please stay out of the carbon trading "business", because it does not serve the people.

Apparently already done...

trade for what? the ability to allow the wealthy to polute.

Trading program should be studied to see if it actually works

no such thing

Probably makes since if a national GHG policy is enacted, which I think is the best approach.

Why don't have an actual debate with real scientists instead of liberal politicians to decide your course of action instead of useless, pointless, and ineffective legislation. There is no proof of global warming, the earth temperatures have decreased in the last few years.

Good idea.

NO NO NO NO NO

No way I am against selling or trading our good air with polluted air from other places. We are entering dangerous territory if we are willing to destroy others.

No trades - reduce carbon emissions.

Not sure what this actually means. Just trading or reducing?

Too early to get involved. Let's see what goes on at the federal level before we waste our time and energy.

Don't like the sound of these emissions trading programs. If we need to change let's all get on it!

con games

Climate registry? Are you people serious? NO!

Emissions trading is not the answer to reducing overall emissions.

Good idea.

The climate is changing and always has been. Don't think that we can do anything to stop what nature is doing, not man.

A complete waste of taxpayer money.

What is the purpose of this? What result is expected? I have no information on this.

Not necessary and a waste of money.

Federal program is more effective. Wait!

Also so we are represented accurately when some weenie or professor in New York tries to manage us.

knowledge is power.

Excellent idea. Should be done on a global basis.

On the federal level, these things are already being done. Why duplicate?

First you have to recognize that ALL scholars do NOT agree that the earth is warming strictly by GHG. The geology has shown the earth has warned and cooled numerous times. The Artic has rebounded to 2004 levels and the Antartic is growing according to some recent findings. These factors need to be taken into account. Not just the Al Gore school of thought which, as far as I can see, all questions on this survey are pointing at. I see no evidence of even looking at the natural earths changes in this survey.

NO TRADING

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

Do not like trading!!!

this could be a great way to to boost Montana's economy.

Junk Science is Junk Science no matter what other name you give it. Another goverment agency is not necessary.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Too costly. Too much government control.

More administration = more people = more pay roll which = more taxes to control the peoples every move.

What's this a Ponzi scheme?

The State does not need to get involved in this farce.

Emissions trading program? You've got to be kidding!

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.

nonsense !

Yep, surely California and Massachcetts will trade with you.... maybe you can exhange bicyles...they are so useful in Montana.

nope

WRE NOT CAL.

There are too many unknowns to decide this.

again, I'm against emissions trading. the overall reduction of emissions is a goal we should not lose sight of.

Emission trading for carbon will prove to be a scam with the traders making a lot of money.

education and volunteerism needs to be incorporated.

depends on the cost of this participation.

Companies should be required to follow regulations, not buy their way around the regs. They's just pass the cost onto consumers.

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.

Yes! This kind of cooperation and teamwork can do SOOOO much good. People from difference communities and states and regions motivating and inspiring each other by the progress they make, and spread, by sharing their expertise and ideas, and working together for a common cause that effects us on earth today and in the near and distant future.

Carbon credits are a scam. taxpayer theaft is still unconstitutional.

They make Al Gore richer.

Again, more expense!!!

Wait until a federal program becomes available. Montana does not need to do on it's own.

Emissions trading is a joke. Stay out of the trade market.

Sounds like more government control

I understand the reason for the need in "trading programs". But I feel we should not have them. I feel every state or business should meet the standards, and not be able to trade with others who exceed the minimum standards.

Share!!!!!!

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

I can see Montana foreclosing many options for its economic future by doing so. Forget it.

Garbage! Fire everyone, anyone, associated with this stupidity.

It escapes me why this would ever be a consideration.

Unnecessary and costly bureacracy.

Climate is changing all the time, and it always has. What will be done with this information?

Horrible non-solution

look at the program first then decide if you want to lock us into a trading partnership

begrudgingly checked #2 only because I know it is inevitable that we will participate to some level in an emissions trading scheme. I don't believe that kind of program works, though. What about the people who live close to a polluting source that is allowed to continue polluting just because they can trade emission points with a less-polluting plant somewhere else? Dump the plants that cause polluting emissions! Get RID of them! Don't just spread the culpability around. That's cheating. I don't believe carbon offsets work either. Except to make individuals and corporations feel less guilty and to make some other rich!
begrudgingly checked #2 only because I know it is inevitable that we will participate to some level in an emissions trading scheme. I don't believe that kind of program works, though. What about the people who live close to a polluting source that is allowed to continue polluting just because they can trade emission points with a less-polluting plant somewhere else? Dump the plants that cause polluting emissions! Get RID of them! Don't just spread the culpability around. That's cheating. I don't believe carbon offsets work either. Except to make individuals and corporations feel less guilty and to make some other rich!

Don't like emissions trading.

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

I don't like emissions trading. If you don't use it, you lose it.

This makes more sense at national level.

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

Holcim supports the development of a national GHG registry that reconciles the need for transparency with the protection of commercially-sensitive information.

see comments above on the costs of cap and trade, and who bears those costs. Certainly not rich hypocrites like Al Gore!
Only if private funds are used, no tax payer dollars.

We think that Montana should follow the federal lead here.