

ES-8/9 Comments
Recommendation 21

Market based mechanisms to establish a price signal for GHG emissions (GHG cap-and-trade or tax)

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

Carbon tax, cap, trade and credits do nothing for the environment. All are based on money changing hands to offset something. This is nothing but a scheme to generate revenue.

Could there be joint state and federal? I do not trust that our gov. will act in our best interests without checks and balances.

It is not wise to support this until we see what is finally proposed.

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.

I don't think Montana can afford to be a leader on these issues, but if the federal government or large states can make things work well, we should support and follow.

Carbon tax is simpler than carbon trading.

Cap and trade is essential to reducing global warming pollutants, and this recognition from the state is crucial.

A Carbon tax seems to me the best way to accomplish many of these goals, without creating a too cumbersome bureaucracy.

Let the nation speak with one voice - let the feds lead.

Stop mucking up the free markets. Get rid of the subsidies for bad behavior, and let the market then determine the choices.

One size does not fit all and in the big picture Montana is not the problem!! On the national level we're a blip on the radar screen. Just remember that the economy of this state could be affected greatly by federal legislation.

Get involved- Lead, not follow!

Insane!

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

No need to even consider until national actions occur.

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.

I do not support carbon tax or trading.

A sorry half-measure that is better than nothing but dodges doing what needs to be done: end obsolete generation methods while we still have some oxygen left.

Statewide goals should be set, even if only as a gesture to push federal legislation.

This is unnecessary and ineffective.

Cap and trade is not the answer.

I support a Carbon Tax more than a Cap-and-Trade (i.e. "pay to pollute") policy.

Cap and trade is an excuse to reward current polluters with a "property right" that others don't get.

No cap and trade! Tax with goals set! Get tough on crime.

Absolutly wrong. Lets not fight wind mills in our mind.

We need to be proactive we can not wait for the federal government to act.

Got issues with these carbon trades.

Again, why not LEAD? Or does PPL etc. have too many lawyers in \$1,000.00 suits?

I am not a proponent of cap-and-trade -- the "rich" should not be allowed to pollute at the expense of the poor/everyone -- simply because they can afford to pay extra to do it. But if cap-and-trade is the best you can do, then I favor it over nothing (current state).

never us legislation. people can make their own decisions without any government intervention.

we can encourage and educate!

Yes, but it's most important to be certain that everyone's emissions are always decreasing.

Would increase already too high utility costs

Don't bother with something that the national is going to do.

Pay for the messes our purchases generate? Absolutely!

I am against polluting companies being able to buy Certificates from non-polluting companies, thereby continuing to pollute legally. Exxon is the most horrendous example.

Cap and Trade very important.

From what little I know about this one...there's lots of room for loopholes...compliance without really complying...I know it's a complex issue and there are always people/industries that will do an end-run around any legislation. Very frustrating.

the feds are loathe to do this, one state can't stand alone-the western block of states could!

The Competitive Enterprise Institute has done a great study on the problems and cost associated with a Cap and Trade System. It should be reviewed by the committee.

Cap and trade is a copout. A tax would be an incentive.

We can only hope that this legislation will indeed happen at a national level...

Feds lead. We support.

Another way to take money from those who live in Montana. Since when do Montanans give knee-jerk responses to what people in California are doing?

Polluters must pay, or they will have no incentive to clean up their emissions.

I'd prefer a carbon tax to cap and trade.

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.

Agree. Legislation from Congress is likely, especially after the Massachusetts v. EPA case.

Support an economy-wide cap-and-trade system with a fair and just starting point.

Set goals. Don't wait for national legislation.

The government CANNOT and SHOULD NOT set 'price levels' - this is phony and sending the wrong message

I am not sure how a cap and trade will work.

In the future GHG emissions should "cost" producers. Americans will realize we use 25% of the world's energy and if we are planning on continuing this trend, there is an associated price on consumption.

I don't know enough about this to respond appropriately... but can we not start at a state level?

I support economy-wide cap and trade system with a fair and just starting point.

I don't support at the state level, and if it is done it must be national and not even regional.

Let the market and consumers establish what needs to happen.

I like the idea of being market driven but the idea that man caused carbon in the environment is creating global climate change is ridiculous.

Wonderful way to make more millions for Al Gore!

if it is a national level item, then so be it.

keyota has not been ratified, do you understand

No more taxes, please! We can't afford any more! You're destroying our economy to fight a possibly non-existent threat!

Tax over cap-and-trade

over my head

punishment rather than reward again. So what happens if it's not possible? Is a national/global depression and reduction of lifestyle really worth it?

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

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

NO CARBON TAX

Montana should be coming out now in stopping any National legislation that will impact the citizens of Montana. Working now to insure that any national legislation will benefit the people of Montana is the only logical approach.

This is price control and will lead to wage controls which is the objective of socialism and communism. If we come to this we as a nation are done for.

What is good at a national level is not always good for Montana. If we are going to set it up we should do it at a state level. I don't believe that there should be a market for emissions. The wealthy should not be able to pollute more than anyone else just because they have money.

that is where it should come from Feds

This will need to happen nationally.

A carbon tax is not a market based signal... Cap and trade will not work and is economically inefficient way to reduce GHG.

A cap and trade at the federal level is the best way to accomplish market mechanisms.

I like the idea of a carbon tax--I don't think cap and trade is the way to go.

I agree that this should be a national effort, not just by Montana. It should also cover all sectors - residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, and agricultural.

??

This will be a battle over who ends up with the money derived from a cap and trade program, or a tax

Leave it at the national level.

Very important. Why can MT not act on a state carbon tax? This would get MT businesses ahead of the game when national carbon taxes arrive. It would be made revenue-neutral, of course.

no loopholes please

Buying and selling the right to pollute is obviously a spiral down to destruction. We need to have a optimistic survivable alternative. Stop looking at profit driven free market capitalism for answers. Start looking at lifecosystems and trying to sustain them through all of our energy endeavors.

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

I support taxing carbon. Market based solutions will not accomplish the goals that the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change believes will alleviate our stress on the Earth.

Cap and Trade along with a carbon tax to even out the playing field and let the population wake up to the true costs of doing business upon today's polluted environment in which we all live.

Too complicated to understand.

See comments above on need for a combination of tax, offset, efficiency and demand management

con games

This is already being abused

Push congressmen to pass this at the national level with caveats to reduce "hotspot" pooling by maintaining regulations on pollutants such as mercury. If carbon trading can stay within accepted limits for mercury and other toxins, proceed.

Legislation at a national level should be opposed too. Carbon taxes are the papal indulgences of the modern age. Pay the Church of Al Gore and you can pollute to your heart's content.

As long as it is not taxed.

Residential. Use tax - the higher the use and carbon generation the higher the tax rate.

I don't support state action on this. This is better handled on a national, or even international, level. No carbon tax!!!

No money should be wasted on GHG. There is so much counter science to global warming that the counter science needs to be fully investigated. One to check out is www.earthchangesmedia.com and do a search on global warming. You may be in for a surprise!

Montana could be the economic loser in this. Just as cap and trade policies described in the Kyoto protocol would have left developing countries without industry/economic development. Montana may receive small payments from other states in exchange for a carbon sink in MT, while the industrial state can continue business as usual.

Just say NO to carbon taxes.

Are we going to join the western coalition.

Agree. This must be national.

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>

Fight it at any and every level. Make Congress aware of our refusal to rush like Lemmings over the Global Warming Cliff -- this stuff is "bad science."

Keep all GHG emitting corporations out of the discussion and/or set up strict guidelines for these corporations to follow. Keep the fox from designing the chicken house in other words.

Keep this on national level.

Again no goals. Carbon credits are a bogus idea. Give credits to an industry or individual. Then the "clean" guy sells his excess to the "dirty" guy. End result is a no change in the overall picture. Ask AL GORE how this works in benefit for the dirty guy. He is listed under hypocrite!

Tax preferable to cap & trade

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

I am not in favor of market based mechanisms - it fails to provide decisive goal oriented reductions in our CO2 production. We can not be talking status quo but a move away from fossil fuels, as quickly as possible.

Another ploy to get more money form the citizens of Montana and the Nation.

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

Too costly.

No matter what you want to ask for your product ... government will step in and establish the price you will be authorized to charge.

just more loopholes to be manipulated by large corporations, more government, red tape. Just cap carbon and be done with it.

Another scam - so if PPL purchases all of Montana's credits, and sells all of the power to California, we could put Montana out of work to keep the AC on in California and the profits rolling in PA?

This is the worst thing that could happen to GHG emissions. It's just a way for investors to get rich. strike this immediatley and do something that actually matters.

The State already control electric pricing, and look what it has gotten us.

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.

State govt could push the feds on this point!

Excess busy-work . . . expensive useless make work activity

Market based Mechanisms? To tell the government what to do? You have to be joking.

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING IS BASED ON JUNK SCIENCE. PLEASE DO THE RESEARCH AND DON'T STEAL FROM THE PUBLIC THAT YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT!

Why would MT consider this until it becomes possible nationally?

Any legislation should be crafted to ensure real life gains, not just a stock market trading situation.

Very much in favor of market mechanisms...needs to happen nationally.

Maybe a cap and trade but not carbon tax.

?

I think government needs to be more aggressive. I believe we are in a crisis and market based strategies do not adequately address the problem. Even if we were able to cut GHG emissions completely we cannot immediately stop global warming. That train has already left the track. But maby we can begin the healing process.

I don't feel that cap and trade has any value. It does little to clean the area nearest to the pollution. It may very well help globally but not locally !

Make it more expensive to pollute than to burn clean.

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.

not big on cap and trade-- seems like it lets wealthy emitters buy their way out of regs.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL!!!no more power to federal government! this is a states issue!

sounds like this is a federal issue - why include it for the state?

Montana needs to await action at the federal level.

don't wait for the feds, if you want real change locally, they have been totally unreliable in this area
Carbon Tax!

I do not agree with the cap-and-trade program. I believe there should be cap and fines for not meeting emission standards

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

Duh! Reality appears!

Joke!

Carbon tax and cap are good; I don't see how carbon trades help - they just shift the carbon!

I do not like the idea of carbon trade.

No benefits, totally unnecessary.

only as part of a national plan

Has to be national or it would just export jobs and industry (leakage) to other states

not needed here

FRAUD

Let the national level rule.

GOT THAT NOW AS I SAID BEFORE---GOES DOWN TO MONTHLY POWER BILLS

Don't agree with cap and trade.

We're not breaking new ground with this. Just follow, or join with the other states who are developing these mechanisms.

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.

We could start at the state level.

Wait for national legislation.

This is a national policy decision.

Cap and Trade is lingo for keeping the current economic capitalist model. This model is at the core of the entire problem.

See above comments on carbon taxes. These will be awful for Montana's economy.

A cap and trade system if enacted in its current form on the national level would threaten Montana's tourist economy by forcing unwanted pollution on the rural and poorer communities. Pollution is much more likely to be dealt with if it is contained where it is produced.

Critically important to tax windfall of new carbon market. Tax receipts need to pay for impacts on high-carbon energy workers and low-income people, also help subsidise alternative energy research and development.

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

Holcim supports the use of an appropriately-designed national GHG cap-and-trade scheme as the market-based mechanism establish a price signal for GHG emissions.

I don't see the federal level helpful. Need a new administration.

This is meaningless.

keep it at the national level

Insufficient information.

Al Gore has a carbon footprint big enough to squash a small village. When that hypocrite gives up his mansion, and all rich environmentalists reduce their carbon footprint (mansions and second homes) to that of the average American, only then should we jack up energy prices to placate those who want to believe in gloom and doom. Cap and trade, or GHG tax, is a way to achieve "conservation" by jacking up prices, which will bother the rich not one little bit. "Conservation" will come from low income folks turning down their heat in the winter (AKA, shivering in the dark), giving up their trip to yellowstone with the kids because gas is too high prices, or suffering the summer heat without air conditioning because they can't afford the bill.

We support the recommendation that Montana not take a policy position on a specific price signal approach.

???

This doesn't seem to do anything.

We should not skirt local opportunities to act based on potential action at the national level. Recognizing the amount of carbon generated in production, an activity, etc...is a fair measure of other pollution and impacts as well. It should be done across the board in an equitable way that treats new or old emissions equally.