

TLU-13 Comments
Recommendation 38
Reduced GHG emissions from aviation

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

There may be some benefits of GHG emissions from aviation on a global scale. Refer to "The Weather Makers" by Tim Flannery.

What impact will these reduce emissions have on safety and performance of airplanes?

These efforts will result in higher costs to airlines that will be passed on to consumers. Not a good idea.

This is not only an important source of GHG, but the lingering contrails from jets actually reduce our ability to generate solar power.

Finally, an acknowledgment that this is a federal responsibility.

We already subsidize the national aviation industry lets add more taxes to our budgetary needs.

If aviation's behavior threatens the environment and public health, remove the subsidies that allow aviation to violate existing standards. Aviation will use the free market to change, if it is engaging in unhealthy behavior.

Again with the limited air service to Montana at the present time. How much do you expect to cut?

Impose landing fees on private aircraft.

Wind power holds them up but it won't make em go!

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

Tax airplanes for air pollution. Reduce the number of airports, and require airplanes to carry liability insurance.

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.

Follow Virgin Airlines example

More costs for the airline industry. Sure, and while we're at it let's tax the domestic auto industry too.

I think that aviation pollution - air and noise - has a much broader impact than we think and I would be elated to have those issues addressed on a national level. I think the pollution effects the health and quality of waterways and wildlife, as well farms and ranch animals, to a much larger extent than is recognized.

Public needs to know how high GHG's are from aviation - yes - push this - better fuel standands and encourage/develop better railroad public transit throughout the state.

This could be the biggest step the state of Montana could take to reduce GHG emissions.

Absolutely, air pollution from flying is incredible (in a bad way). If we want to keep up mass transit by air, there has to be a cleaner way to do it.
Probably not very feasible for Montana, but national standards should be encouraged.

Why are you calling for federal policies here while calling for state policies on other interstate matters like your proposals in TLU-7 and TLU-8.

Commercial air travel on a per capita basis is the biggest problem here. I know it is hard to get the numbers, but they are readily available in Great Britain and Europe. We in the US want to ignore it.

Feds lead.

Good luck, MT is already a fly-over state.

Laws of physics again! Only real solution is to reduce air travel if you want to reduce aviation GHG emissions.

Studies show that there is zero climate benefit to such investments. Clearly there is no consensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

A low priority.

See the cd the "Dimming of the Sun," developed by a university in the east and shown on PBS.

they are continually developing more efficient engines - or havent you noticed??

I think you should be damn careful telling the aeronautics industry what type of fuel they should use...there is not much room for experimentation up there.

Isn't the cost of air travel high enough for you?

With the high cost of fuel this should take place under our free market system.

Increase the already ludicrous plane ticket prices? Why?

stop the government from spraying us with chemicals (chem-trails)

Federal duty.

over my head

Only if the technology exists to cost-effectively achieve this.

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

Montana already cannot keep needed aviation services. Any more costly requirements that are not nationally driven will only make the travel problems worse, making economic development even harder

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

Pie in the sky!~

Again If the GHG Emissions are reduce by better burning then the airlines would make more money and they would not have to have incentives to make the change. but that is not the case. you would add cost that would increase prices, and make travel more difficult. This is a goal of socialism in order to control what and where people go and spend their money.

Work on the jets that blatantly leave chemical trails across our skies that turn sunny days into hazy disasters. Private and even commercial airliners here do not seem to leave any kind of detectable emissions.

State employees, including the Governor, could stop flying.

Keep the fed out the sellout to the highest bidder.

Are we planning on powering our jets with a new hybrid H2O fuel? Or maybe compressed air?

I am not sure where you are going with this but it seems to me that the people that are the most convinced and that stand to gain the most from global warming (Al Gore) sure flies around the world a lot and doesn't seem to think that he is part of the problem

Airfare costs in Montana are already through the roof. This will only increase them.

This should be a national requirement. Montana doing this on thier own will only result in increased costs to Montanas with little benefit to climate change. It will also put the Montana aviation community at an economic disadvantage if it is not a national requirement.

Federal issue.

Come on, worry about what can be done in Montana, not the feds.

Airports are often the most polluted zone of a city-

A must do.

Montana currently spends some money promoting tourism. That spending therefore encourages aviation. Reduced spending would serve the purpose of reduced GHG gases from aviation. Alternatively, redirection of spending to directy encourage train travel would also reduce GHG gases.

fantasy land safety issues

Once Montana is one of the leading producers of GHG from aviation then worry about this.

Junk science. No.

Leave private aviation alone!

The cost of owing and operating a small airplane is already astronomical, we don't need government intervention to make it worse.

Besides having no valid scientific basis to require reduced greenhouses gases from aviation, this concept is naive and unenforceable.

Now we want to stop airline flights. I suppose we'll outlaw horses when someone studies the GHG contribution of horse poo.

Good idea. This shouldn't cause a raise in consumer prices though.

How about a small carbon off-set tax at our airports for incoming flights?

The aircraft industry has already undertaken large efforts to reduce fuel consumption and engine efficiency. Aviation users have been and will always find the most effective way to operate their engines, do you know that all light general aviation aircraft has a mixture control and most have an exhaust gas temperature gauge to measure the most effective setting.

Again, a fine idea. This group is already use to alot of regulations already and on many levels. They know there are folks watching them so I would guess their adherence would be better.

Sure let the Feds spend my taxes.

This also should be regulated Federally. Too many State regulations will drive business out of Montana. We already drive enough business out of state with our tax structure.

As long as it doesn't cause the public to pay increased airfares.

At what cost? How many acres that are needed for food will be growing biofuels? How many acres of grassland will be destroyed to make biofuels How much wildlife habitat will be lost? How many endangered plants and animals will be effected? When you know that, ask me again.

Too much fed control now. Way too costly.

Yea, right! Tell the Defense Department of the United States to shut down until they adopt this ruling.

How about just prohibiting any non-military aircraft with less than 50 people? Including no jet for the governor, and the governor and state officials must include a report on what reductions in CO2 they will make for any air travel for any reason?

Not needed, the State is not a lobbying agency, it is not a function of the State.

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.

Should be voluntary based on economy and appeal.

Of course. Why not screw with the airlines? They don't provide any useful service to people in Montana

Not a bad plan if approached on a national level

Cost efficiency..... Who pays?

What is the emissions from aviation in ratio to emissions from multi-passenger modes of transportation (ie: buses and passenger trains)?

Why do we need all these small town air strips which are such a waste of taxpayer money and encourage wasteful use of resources.

good.

Another critical category.

Stick to a state, preferably not Montana. D.C. does enough to screw things up.

keep the federal pollicy out. pollicys should be state wide, not federal.

Not the State's business. Aviation is an international mode of transportation. It's already under heavy scrutiny. Let the Feds. do their job.

biofuel planes!

This is key, if we could reduce GHG emissions for jet fuel we could greatly reduce our total GHG emissions.

Excellent.

No Position

Don't waste Montana dollars on this. If enough other states want it, we'll get it, won't we.

The way things are going, we'll be lucky if we have any airplanes flying in this state in a few years. We should be making this state attractive to these businesses instead of trying to chase them away with taxes and regulations.

What aviation? There is so little plane service in Montana, I don't think it matters.

We have enough trouble getting airlines to serve Montana, without encouraging more Government meddling that will lead to higher operating costs.

Big Sky already shut down. Whos next? Imput costs costs us all.

The proportion of global carbon emissions coming from aviation is miniscule, and cuts in such emissions will have little overall impact on aggregate emissions or the earth's climate.

Check your sources for where the GHG emissions are coming from.

This is a big one as airplanes may be the worst cause of GHG's by the mere fact that they put the gases high up in the air

BEEN DOING THIS IN DEVELOPEMENT OF NEW POWERPLANT AND AIRFOIL TECHNOLOGIES SINCE THE DAWN OF AVIATION---WHERE HAS GOVERNMENT BEEN???

Don't spend too much time on this one. We have plenty to deal with on the State level.

If auto and truck transport would catch up to the energy efficiency of aviation, we'd be a lot farther ahead. They have already figured out that lighter means cheaper and have adapted construction materials accordingly.

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

This is a federal standard issue.

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

national program needed, aviation knows no state boundary.

Going to have to limit the amount of flights available. businesses need to be given a limit on how much travel they can write off. Business people do not have to fly to meetings across the country and back. Live meetings can be done where you are located.

Only if private funds are used, no tax payer dollars.