

RCII-7 Comments
Recommendation 7
Support for implementation of clean combined heat and power

Target state-built examples to demonstrate the technology.

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.

Would this be an incentive or a mandate?

The report is less than clear on what this is exactly, at least to a lay-person.

Adding to the bureaucracy

What is the cost?

While distributed generation is a good idea in concept, intermittent (e.g. wind) distributed generation comes at a cost. The utilities must balance this generation with dispatchable generation, likely gas-fired combustion turbines.

WIND POWER!

What does this mean or promote?

Where is the summary? What is this? The survey is long enough without having to link to a "final report"

This would be especially useful for large applications such as schools and hospitals.

Not defined

I understand this would require subsidies.

Let the market do its job.

Are you looking at combined cycle generation or small combined heat and power units for residential application?

I agree with "Support" rather than mandates.

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

no reference to final cost to consumers

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.

Not sure what this is.

I support only if not taxed.

Costly and mostly impractical.

Clean heat and power may be good, however, we don't need to force anything on people through governmental incentives.

How about going to wood heat, its the best heat in the world. The idea that it not clean does not hold water if you compare it to just letting our forest burn every summer as opposed to cutting the trees and using them for heat in clean burning stoves.

Coal is still the most efficient source of energy in terms of land area that we have. Let's use it. Geothermal also has great potential.

Duh?

Yes. Combined heat and power makes sense for cold climate state such as MT and where solar/wind generated electricity seems best.

No details. What is considered "clean" What is the method of obtaining compliance.

I don't know what this means, and every time I click on the final report, it wipes out my previous answer, so I won't go looking for it. congratulations on a well-formatted (sarcasm intended) survey

Biofuels are not "clean" and use more energy than they produce. They also adversely impact climate change by the use of more pesticides and fertilizers, which run into the oceans and kill the organisms that remove CO2 from the atmosphere. Why doesn't anyone ever say that?

I'd need to know more about what this entails before supporting it enthusiastically.

As long as it is not fake. Nukes are fake. What we proved in Montana in 89 is still totally valid today.

What is this?

Needs additional research for applications in MT.

No new coal, please.

Define "clean." Obviously, the efficiency benefits of cogeneration are of interest.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

Report doesn't clearly explain what this means.

CHP makes the most sense in terms of providing heat and power efficiently.

Am not sure how that would be accomplished.

Like Motherhood and Apple Pie - the state could support it, but through non-agenda driven educational means only

With the majority of primary energy sources loosing the majority of their energy potential through waste heat, combined heat and power generation would dramatically improve efficiency.

Not thoroughly explained what this means??????

put our coal to work for the people of Montana

Shouldn't the state take a leadership role in funding technology to reach goals versus mandating standards which do not have a proven technology?

Fine as long as it does not increase taxes or cause artificial increase in energy or construction costs.

I believe this is targeted to restrict the burning of wood, coal and other other means for family's to heat their homes in some area's of Montana

how will this be fleshed out? i need a quick blurb if you expect me to fill out a survey...i don't have time to refer to other documents and read them to detmine if i suppor this or not.

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

Let the counties and municipalities decide what form/source/regulations they want to put on power generation.

In other words, forcing people to have "clean" combined heat and power, where the definition of "clean" is placed in the control of beaurocrats.

Tax breaks for Clean Combined Heat and Power, not additional fees on current energy sources. Please note the Governor's letter to Mr. Richard Opper admonishes Mr. Opper that many citizens do not have the cushion in their family budgets to absorb these additional costs.

No mandates!!

What is clean heat and power??Wind? Solar?

Opposed.

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> The above video destroys the myth of human caused global warming. Get informed. The truth shall make you free.

too generic ?

Let the Free Markets do it.

Intent of this recommendation, is noble, but is so open ended, without any restraints, could result in more unfunded mandates on the citizens of Montana. metering will come at a cost to the citizens, this has not been qualified.

This like the item above, have no cost/benefit analysis. Since from my understanding of the situation if we were to reduce CO2 emissions from all human sources we would only reduce including our breathing we would change the amount of CO2 by only less than 5% and the CO2 accounts for only about 3.62 of all greenhouse gases when you include water vapor thus human cause Co2 is about accord to http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/greenhouse_data.html the total greenhouse gases from Human sources is 0.28% (less than 1/3 of one percent. I ask What is such a small change going to make any difference.

Good idea if not legislation or red tape is added to affect the business or individual. Offer incentives.

This too should be done through education and not codes.

This doesn't seem to be one of the more effective recommendations.

What is this?

If distributed generation were the way to go, would we be trying to reduce the number of cars on the road?

Would support if it is restricted to our government offices/buildings.

Too costly. \$\$\$\$ will come from those least capable of paying, the working poor & Naive Americans.

Unsure what "Clean Combined Heat" is in reference to.

I would surely like to see the elimination of burning wood for heat. We all know that this burning creates toxins in the air we all must breathe and I do not believe we should have to be victims. At a minimum, provide incentives for better wood stoves. Everywhere in Helena smells like smoke from wood burning when temperatures fall. Inversions make it worse. I know it is dangerous.

Sounds expensive and discourages the development of our coal reserves in Montana.

we need to prioritize funding for clean coal technology such as the now dead in the water Futuregen project, and start thinking nuclear power and reprocessing spent rods. Or supporting the above.

tax breaks for rich

If it was a good idea, the private sector would have done it.

With all our thermal heat sources all over this state its a shame that we are seeking foreign made products. Why are we not nuclear?

Clean efficient energy production is good.

While we support alternative sources of heat and power, our abundance of fossil fuels must be utilized to provide more jobs and economic development. We believe the technology is there to go forward with coal development.

Again, the sooner the better. However, COAL IS NOT AN ANSWER in any form. Coal only serves those encouraging its use a healthy profit, at the expense of the environment that we all need to have cleaner. We can tell you first hand, that wind and solar power works well and is improving constantly.

Not always the best way to go

Do not build any coal-fired power facilities until all contaminants can be contained.

Need to understand full impact - needs more analysis.

No! Not until the technology can be shown to be cost effective.

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

To have government support the this program is a fine idea, but alas, in due time it will become totally controlled by government; a program that is 180 degrees from being a free 'people.'

example: furniture factory tailings burned in high efficiency boiler with steam generator attached

The State should stay out of this, as special interest groups would control what people are told.

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.

Vague

Use the fuel loads in overgrown forests to produce heat and energy in biomass cogeneration plants. This use of waste hazardous fuels removed from forests rather than raising farm crops to burn.

How can we object to an adjective like 'clean'? This question is just another trap.

Government should stay out of business.

NO!

we need to use are natural resource. were not cal.

Getting the coal industry on board will continue to be the challenge. Encourage them with incentives to reduce carbon, mercury and other pollutants.

What does Clean Combined Heat and Power mean, what does it ban and what does it promote?

This is confusing. I can't support something I don't understand. I need a clearer description.

This probably help in cities, but doubt if it would help in rural areas.

I have no idea what this means.

Something where every citizen can play a positive role. We need to work TOGETHER to lick this life-threatening problem, and this is one way to do that.

Cows create a lot of body heat & methane gas, all from one animal. Maybe we can use cows as a blueprint for this one.

The bad thing is it will block up our rivers and dam up our water ways...

Don't understand this enough to comment

Alternative sources of heat and power are good ideas, but we have an abundance of fossil fuels to be utilized which will provide more jobs and economic development. Coal development should be encouraged.

I don't know what this means, but have concerns about the claims for "clean coal."

We elected you to represent us. not control us.

Set time frame.

Wind generation solar..... get away from coal fired

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

Oh, sure. Have any of you listened to the screaming about Highwood? **NOT IN MY BACK YARD.** I support combined generation, but how centralized is Montana at this point? And just TRY to place a nuke facility and the associated piping in, say, Helena. Industrial facilities that can make use of combined power are doing so. Leave it lay there.

I've said yes, that I support this, but it is with full reservations... the devil is in the details, and the level of support is still open. I support the concept, but would need to review costs, impact, governmental influence, balance of information, etc.

I fully believe that the technology is developed that will sensibly and safely allow Montana to tap into our abundant fossil fuels. Progress and an intensified need to reduce our importing of oil demands that Montana develop our natural resources including coal, oil and natural gas. I support alternatives as well, but Montana must quit shooting ourselves in the foot by keeping our fossil fuels locked up, our children and grandchildren migrating out of state for jobs, and our economy at the mercy of out-of-state big money purchasing up what used to be used for agriculture.

Most utilities and electric coops are already doing this. No government meddling will improve it.

Depends on who pays for implementation and how clean is defined.

supporting people who do most of the improvements the government suggests and gives money for usually goes to people who can already afford improvements. Those with little money usually cannot afford they part they are required to pay. They go without.

who defines clean combined heat and power?

All of us now contain pollutants which are undermining our health. Many of these pollutants come from unclean power.

Combined heat and power in the home works well where natural gas prices are low and where there is 100% net metering to sell the excess electricity back to the utility. If both of these factors are not in place, then combined heat and power only works on a commercial scale; otherwise, it is imperative that all businesses with large energy usage look into this concept - but first, it always most important to look at ways to conserve.

Sounds vague. Need to go back and read this section again.

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

This seems a reasonable idea - its all in the implementation.

What does this "Support for Implementation of Clean Combined Heat and Power" mean? It looks like ICCHP capitalized is an acronym, but it's not on the acronym list. And why couldn't I click on the relevant pages directly! P.S. Why do government and techno reports use piles of acronyms that make reading them impregnable?

What is this?

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

again, provide tax credits, stop wasting money on more legislation and government-subsidized education

How can I have an opinion when no details are available????!!!(The "final report" is BLANK!!!)

as long as we dump the "HYSTERIA" about global waming and include the reliable clean coal power in any solution

Not in favor of elimination of wood stove heat outside the city limits.

not sure what this means.

Again, most initiatives if they make economic sense will be implemented by industry. What you will do is paint them into a corner and increase energy cost.

Combined heat and Power projects make sense from an efficiency standpoint and they use renewable carbon neutral sources of heat if fired with biomass. CHP and other existing renewable technology should be recognized for existing facilities that are in service and not just future facilities. The forest product segment has been proactive in implementing renewable energy and our efforts to date should be recognized in any actions.

CHP needs to be included in alternative energy definitions. In many cases it is already cost effective, but under current laws it is not considered renewable energy, thus would not count toward a utility's rps.

Smaller co-ops are highly susceptible to major cost shifts from imprudently structured net metering policies

*Safety issues from the interconnection of customer generators remain of major concern to electric cooperatives.