

ES-7 Comments
Recommendation 20
Demand-side management

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

allow demand side efforts to count towards RPS

not sure what you mean here

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.

Don't know what this means.

???????

No opinion.

Create demand by educating the public that it is in their interest to conserve as a benefit to health, welfare, and family budget.

Not knowledgeable

If this means let the free market drive this, then I agree.

Don't put in See RCII or highlight it so people don't have to go find RCII. This survey is long enough as it is.

Should be voluntary.

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

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.

Don't understand.

overlap

Duh?

Demand-side "recommendations" will be less impactful than demand-side changes. Reward and subsidize demand-side changes rather than wasting resources "recommending" or legislating consumption/efficiency levels.

no details. Best demand regulator is the free market.

Again, due to the construction of your survey website, I'm not leaving it to find out what this means

be careful with this one-we have always demanded energy and products at the lowest pricetag-not the lowest actual long term cost to our land

What is this?

Unknown

We should go cold in the winter and hot in summer?

Reducing our demand is the keystone, and it's the cheapest, most proven means of achieving the goal.

Will greatly increase costs unless market driven.

No answer, did not study.

Demand-side Management should be THE priority for this state's energy policies.

I don't know what this is.

Not sure what this is...

Conservation is a very important energy use reduction method.

This ties into education.

A numerical grade on this question will skew the survey...no position.

Let the local utilities meet their goals.

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

Needs clarification.

over my head

Don't know what his means.

I can vote against this twice? Great!

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.

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

Demanding is strong language for this recommendation. To implement RCII, we must keep in mind that the citizens must have an opportunity to participate in the forming of an education program as well as where the cost of this program is going to be derived.

This is double talk, this is like demanding a product to be built, without first determining if anyone want the product. Supply-side management has worked in business and industry for years why add a broken worthless philosophy to the mix. That is what Russia (USSR) did I have been there you do not want to live in such a backward place, where villeges within 20 minutes drive of the capital Moscow draw water from public wells with buckets and ropes, and produce and burdens are carried by horse or mule carts, and the cities are heated by a central heating system and from Mid May to Mid September you have NO heat or hot water. That is what I think of when I think of "Demand-Side Management"

I think that setting up recommendations would be good as long as it was just that a recommendation.

I like this in that it covers all the people. We really need this climate change effort to start with the people. If they really want a change, they can make it happen through their lifestyles.

??

It is ridiculous that you have no Supply Side incentives or ideas. Supply creates jobs.

I don't understand what the implications are for this.

???

Once again, getting consumers to take advantage of offpeak power use will benefit everyone.

Demand management is equivalent to efficiency and conservation. It is and will be essential, including by reducing the demand placed by increasingly super-sized homes.

raise taxes

This is the most effective management tool.

Have no idea what ES-7 means.

No again. The free market can handle this.

As long as it benefit the people and not the corporations.

More government regulations.

Again who is going to buy thses houses? So far this survey is running up a tremendous taxpayer and consumer bill!

Unsure of this one.

Education.

Demand-side management does not work when compared to the natural free market behavior.

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

This spells nothing more than government entering and managing your private buisness.

The State does not need to control everyone, that is called a dictatorship.

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.

not clear

This is as vague as a Senate resolution. What in the world do you mean?

Demand and supply both need to be in play.

Government must take the lead and enforce that all american consumers and businesses make the necessary sacrifices. If demand-side management worked, we wouldn't be in the mess we're in.

Cannot figure what this is about?

I am not knowledgeable about this so won't answer

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.

Go back to Econ 101. Supply & demand must both be in any equation that has a realistic curve.

more unconstitutional money going to big companies at tax payers expense.

???

Is this a question? A statement? I can not agree with this because your wording makes no sense

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

Redundant

not sure what this means

It is a total utility by utility analysis to see if demand side has net gains or not.

Take care, there are so many rules now, we don't have to make it overly difficult for the small guy to live.

What is this about?

Demand-side management should always be dealt with before any increase in supply - sometimes a perceived need for increased supply is falsely assumed.

TOO BROAD

Can't vote as I don't recall RC11 recommendations.

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

I don't understand what this recommendation is trying to accomplish

Not enough information.

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

???

The most important part of all the ES section. The easiest and most cost-efficient solutions to energy dilemmas come from demand-side management.

This should be the most important part of any strategy.

Demand reduction is essential. We can't continue to wastefully use energy.