

**TLU-6 Comments**  
**Recommendation 31**  
**Low carbon fuels**

We're too small to do anything significant on this.

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

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.

Unsure-low carbon vs high carbon?

Most of these ideas are appropriate at the federal or a regional level, not at a Montana-only level. The state can act on its own fleet of vehicles, to the extent practicable.

Too cumbersome.

Incentives to develop and incentives to reduce.

again, i strongly support all except the carbon fuel credits

No! No! No! Montana has no market power. Let the feds lead here. Sheesh!

Doesn't seem this should require new targets, other than remove the subsidies that encourage current bad behavior and damage to public health.

Stongly favor

Encourage the production and use of biodiesel.

Gas already costs too much - hence the afore mentioned Geo Metro.

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

Is Montana a big enough consumer of fuels to require a special "Montana blend"? I see the word taxes again!

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. SMOKE and MIRRORS.

I do support low carbon fuels. However, I think relying on ethanol is not the answer. It takes a lot of energy to provide ethanol so that it barely breaks even. We should be growing food, not energy!

Increase the cost of transacting business in the state.

Do not agree with carbon fuel credits.

I don't know enough chemistry to judge this one, but if it is feasible, go for it. Of course, if we can burn hydrogen, we don't produce any carbon dioxide.

Corn is NOT a good low carbon fuel. Other organic plants such as Switch Grass are far more efficient.

Montana would waste money on a "sin tax" on fuel to "atone" for the imaginary GHG menace?

I'm not comfortable with carbon trading systems. Too much opportunity for loop holes, graft and corruption. Not to mention legislative overrides, special circumstances, etc. It is just a nasty system. Better to cap and regulate than trade. I'm sorry, but those old polluting industries need to get with it.

Yes. Make it costly to avoid dealing with the problem, while simultaneously offering incentives to face it. We can talk ethics and voluntary measures till we're blue in the face. The only way this will get done is via economics.

I do not believe carbon emissions to be an issue of concern, and I do not support restrictions on consumer vehicles in relation to "global warming". I strongly oppose any carbon tax or carbon credits.

This will grow government and set our life style back to the dark ages.

No taxes on high carbon fuels. They are the most efficient method of energy production. We have coal: let's use it.

not familiar with this idea - sounds complicated to track and administer

All these requirements put Montana at a competitive disadvantage with other states.

no legislation. let people use common sense.

Sounds very complex.

too expensive a mandate for a state with such a small market share. Would drive up prices and cut competition in an already competition short area.  
LCFs should not be developed at the expense of energy efficiency and other pollutant emissions (i.e. ethanol)

No use adding more comment, I think I've said it all.

Careful! Biofuels have been shown to not reduce GHG in many instances, often because oil grains must be transported so far for processing. It's important to not use smoke and mirrors (or simple lack of knowledge) to look green.

Don't forget that every acre of land taken out of food production to produce fuel means less food.

not enough-every climatologist worth their salt says we need to be some or another percentage below 1990 co2 levels by 2050 or else

You cannot get an alternative fuel plant sited anyway-where is the new power coming from!! How will low income people and government offset the cost of the carbon tax???

I think you are a bit stary eyed here and may end up creating real economic problems. I hope not, but I wouldn't bet the farm on it.

Again you don't recognize the laws of physics. We get energy by burning carbon. Nothing else even comes close to providing enough calories per unit of fuel.

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.

I am opposed to setting any new standards that will add to costs of any products to Montana consumers. And do not increase gas taxes! We already have high gas taxes here! Many, many Montanans have to drive what they drive because they cannot afford anything different. Don't penalize them further! Let consumers decide.

TOO COSTLY. GOALS ONLY NO STANDARDS OR REGULATIONS. INCENTIVES OK BUT TAXES ARE NOT.

Why not extend this idea and require that those low carbon fuels are produced in Montana? This could be a huge boon for our struggling farmers!

More senseless bureaucracy

Low carbon fuels, produced from biomass, are worrisome at this point. Concerns over long-term benefits, food-for-fuel, carbon balance with production and non-farmed biomass, etc. It is not better for the planet to turn non-farmed biomass areas into fuel sources as it disrupts ecosystems, decreases biomass for CO2 absorption, and increases fuel demands for cultivation.

Yes, but we should not support corn ethanol. From what I understand, the fertilizer, fuel for equipment, etc. does nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Although ethanol burns cleaner, the energy expended to produce it and the lower mpg make this an ineffective method to reduce GHG. Work harder on efficiency.

This could well double the price of gas, good idea Jim Jensen...NO!

Is this doable with today's vehicles?

Waste of time and money. Will do nothing to help global climate change. Will only drive costs up.

Amen!

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

):-

Would hurt the poor greatest.

Carbon is what burns in most engines, eliminate women from wasting fuel, go back to one vehicle per household, then we would have plenty of fuel.

Absolutely a good idea to support biodiesel and homegrown energy from Montana farmers. State vehicles at a minimum.

Stay with the federal standards

Messing with the fuel blends only increases the cost to consumers and has little benefit beyond raising refinery profits.

Alcohol based fuel derived from sugar beets is a good plan.

no tax on high carbons

I like providing incentives for low-carbon fuel development but oppose a tax on high carbon fuels until low carbon fuels cost effective and available. Don't care what you do with state vehicles as long as it doesn't cost the taxpayer an arm and a leg.

The goal should be higher.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. No new taxes. Montana's poor and middle class cannot pay any more for energy.

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

Let the Free Markets Do it.

We are not a Communist or Nanny state.

Not practical in Montana

Low carbon fuels cost more money. The economy of Montana cannot withstand more impacts to every day expenses required to live here.

Another tax and incentive plan--it will cost us taxpayers dearly to protect us from global warming that has not been proven nor accepted by even NOAA, who now claim the ice caps are not melting. and the polar bear in "Gore" Movie was taken in August, when the Ice in the Arctic always melts. Funny how a non scientist like Gore can led us to spend millions of Taxpayers dollars when the millions he spent trying to get elected on such principles were wasted.

In favor of all except, increase tax on high carbon fuels. Punish those that can't afford to race out and buy into the NEW...

This is ridiculous. Do more research. REAL research.

Increased cost and higher taxes.

ESablish that this is needed first

I beleive that this whole alternative fuel thing is a farce. You need to take a look at the fesiability and cost of making enough fuel and also the amount of fossil fuel it takes to make alternative fuel. It just doesn't add up to me. I think we would be better off just burning the fossil fuel.

Carbon Trading needs to be done on a trial basis with stationary plants to see how it will work. Should not be used for transportation related vehicles. Agree that state fleets could be required to use low carbon fuels if available.

Cost, Cost Cost

Carbon Trading needs to be done on a trial basis with stationary plants to see how it will work. Should not be used for transportation related vehicles. Agree that state fleets could be required to use low carbon fuels if available.

pie in the sky

Seems like something that will increase costs to Montanans. I think this should be addressed on a national level.

It's a great idea, if its possible...and economically feasible.

I am opposed to taxing existing carbon fueled plants

More taxes, great idea. In 20 years you will be wishing there was a greenhouse effect.

This is a national issue.

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

Low carbon fuel options create other market problems.

Make it 40% by 2020.

10% by 2020?! that's kind of pathetic. Why not 50%?! or and least 25% by 2015.

All gasoline should have 10% alcahol and diesels 10% biodiesel.

would have to be nation wide

fantasy land con games tax breaks for the rich

Make them convert and use alcohol based efficiency addatives too

"Government is not the solution to our problems, it IS the problem"

Biodiesel will probably be one of the worst if the analysis is done correctly. It should be performed correctly.

This Carbon crisis is a scam.

This will likely burden Montanans with increased fuel costs

Again, sounds very expensive. What would we really gain from this.

Wow, as a Montana teacher I see "Require" "Develop" and "Increase" over and over again, I wonder what's going to be left for Montana's already starved schools when you've paid for all this new beauracracy?

Just say NO to carbon "credits" and taxes. There are many, many faults with this approach.

TAXES?

This technology is not ready yet. Montana too small to drive change. Ethanol really not good for environment.

There is no guarantee that low carbon fuel will be widely available in 2020. This policy would ensure that where it is not available, consumers would have to pay more in tax.

Penalize transportation fuel??

Bogus-I put 10% ethanol in my car, ethanol has less BTU/lb so my mileage goes down, I burn more fuel total with the end result the same amount of emissions I started with. With present technology it costs (dollars and emissions) as much to produce the alternative fuels as what we're burning now so where is the saving.

Good plan as long as some low carbon fuels are available everywhere, otherwise the tax will make fuel prices unbearable.

EPA already controls this. The distribution system is not in place to legislate this yet.

Waste of money.

All good except trading system: too easy to fudge + confuses the issue -- i.e., that nobody should be exceeding standards, no matter how wealthy, etc.

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.

Quite a bit of micro-management going on here - always remember the big problem - burning coal to run our inefficient buildings!!!! Need to include more renewable source incentives and big ones - so most will buy that hybrid car.

This will cost too much. It will provide no change in planetary temperature.

It is important to note that Montana has a wide array of incentives in statute to enhance biofuel development. Clearly this is a tax increase on traditional transportation fuel providers, but in addition it creates the need for another government program to account for, trade and monitor low carbon fuels. This recommendation sets up traditional petroleum based fuels producers to bear the entire cost of low carbon fuels. This is a case where a recommendation to address climate change drives up costs to MPA members. The effect of this recommendation is unknown to Montana's transportation fuel providers and could make us providers non-competitive with those in other states.

Low carbon fuels will cost more, so this doesn't even make sense.

Again, that word ... require! Nothing more than mandate; complete control of the people. This is Montana - not a State where the people are nothing more than puppets!

This is not needed and the State should leave it alone. Why go along with carbon farce? Our law "makers" need to act on facts when making laws.

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.

Incentives are always a great idea.

Wasteful in time and energy in relation to any value derived from the effort.

Sounds like California. Great place to be stuck in traffic or dependent on a union to get you from A to B.

**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!**

carbon is good for plants

This will happen if the transport vehicles are available at competitive market prices

the "trading" portion of this goal doesn't seem to make a lot of sense if it means the total amount of carbon in the atmosphere is not reduced.

Tax, Tax, Tax

When SUV's and/or other vehicles are proven to be the cause of warming on Mars also, then I'll think about it, otherwise keep gov't's nose outa things 'cause they just screw'em up worse!

Great, esp. if it would save farmers, rural folks money? Not entirely clear that it will from report-- future cost savings are a big incentive.

Better to phase out high carbon fuels. Again suggest you avoid the tax idea (on high carbon fuels). The carrot always works better than the stick.

Ohhhhhh-10%!!

good one.

Needs to be implemented sooner. 18 years for this measure to be implemented makes a mockery of this legislation.

Right on the money.

Let's see, Diesel - carbon based fuel, gasoline - carbon based fuel, ethanol - carbon based fuel, bio-diesel - carbon based fuel, coal (liquified) - that's right - carbon based fuel ... electric vehicles, gee, the majority of our electricity comes from natural gas & coal generation - both carbon based fuel

carbon tax is fraud and is a bad idea. to trade carbon credits just makes polluters buy what they need with out the local citizens input and other rich companies get tax payers money for nothing. .

Low carbon fuels may not be as effective as finding ways to reduce carbon emissions.

Will these fuels be available? How are these incentives funded? Definitely not in favor of more taxes!!!

A number of different blends are already available. Market demands will determine what blends will be produced not a state-set target.

Junk science. Carbon credits is a joke. Ask Mr. Al Gore.

Needs to also look at the carbon necessary to produce the low carbon fuel.

I would like to see this date changed to 2012.

Now you are try to put a lid on wood burning as an alternative heat source.

Go for a higher percentage then 10%. Try for 20% by 2020.

It is important to note that Montana has a wide array of incentives in statute to enhance biofuel development. Clearly this is a tax increase on traditional transportation fuel providers, but in addition it creates the need for another government program to account for, trade and monitor low carbon fuels. This recommendation sets up traditional petroleum based fuels producers to bear the entire cost of low carbon fuels. This is a case where a recommendation to address climate change drives up costs to MPA members. The effect of this recommendation is unknown to Montana's transportation fuel providers and could make us providers non-competitive with those in other states. Additionally, Recent research indicates that the land use practices associated with biofuel production actually exacerbate the global warming problem. Two new studies published in Science for the first time take a comprehensive look at the emission effects of land use change resulted from the conversion of forest and grassland t

No.

This absurd proposal assumes CO2 is a pollutant...it is not. I suggest requiring all state employees be required to ride a bicycle everywhere...a horse may be substituted where applicable.

Carbon offsets should not be taken seriously. At this time, the concept is rampant with hypocrisy and the net value is neutral (that is, if there is any validity to the concept).

Fuel is high enough without additional taxes. Also, one must evaluate the cost efficiency of low carbon fuels in mpgs, compared to today's fuels.

I think we can do this for more than 10% of the vehicles and sooner than 2020.

This would destroy Montana's economy and quality of life. Cost, bureaucracy, not needed.

Rely on national programs

This is too little too late. We should up the percentage as well as the date by 10 years.

Instead further analysis of the carbon footprint of all inputs for ethanol production be done to objectively assess the comparison to conventional fuel.

what is a low carbon fuel???????????

more than 10%

if you have a state vehicle and you are in very rural MT running out of fuel in one of Montana's bad 4 seasons quarter do you m,fuel up with whats there or...

No new taxes.

National issue.

This is ridiculous. Several studies recently released, and even announced on CNN, are showing the fuels made from renewable resources, like corn, are contributing negatively to greenhouse gas emissions. Our country is leading the world in the reduction of GHG emissions. Carbon fuel credits are absurd. DO NOT increase taxes on high carbon fuels until you know that these are the problem. In the meantime, corn and wheat and these other items being used for these bio-fuels are FOOD. Continuing this route will very well contribute to a food shortage-- which we're already beginning to feel-- and then where will we be?

Until we become a carbon-free society, it will be necessary to implement standards and limitations on energy providers

ABSOLUTELY UNDOABLE!!!

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

Need more than 10% reduction for any of this to matter. See "Rosey Revisited," at [Globalwarmingsolutions.org](http://Globalwarmingsolutions.org)

waste of time, should be national in nature. cannot have this type of regulation requiring a hodge podge of state regs.

Another feel good objective without much thought. Get knowledgeable people working on this. Leaving MDT largely out of the CCAC effort was a bad idea.

Are these cheaper? Do we save any money or spend more money for this project? Do the oil based fuels work in the cold or do the vehicles always need to be plugged in?

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

Proper accounting of carbon use in fuel development is a good approach, especially in the wake of cap and trade.

I am not real supportive of carbon trading.

Money talks, but we still have the emissions. What about make them eventually phased out then illegal to run.

Does this differentiate between fossil carbon and current carbon--that is, between fossil-fuel derived "carbon fuels" and biofuels? If not, it should make that distinction clearly.

greater than 10%

how much?

50% would be even better.

too expensive. not justified by the evidence.

While it is a reasonable goal to decrease reliance on fossil fuels, this will likely increase costs in the near-term, which could put Montana business at a competitive disadvantage with other states. We think that any action on this should follow a federal lead.

A Low Carbon Fuel Standard is designed to reduce the content of Greenhouse Gases in transportation fuels. Montana's Climate Change Advisory Committee (CCAC) recently recommended policies related to Low Carbon Fuels and recommended the adoption of a Low Carbon Fuel Standard. A Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) is based on the net amount of carbon transportation fuels emit per unit of energy they provide. This standard ensures better accounting of fuel and policy impacts, both in terms of environmental objectives and economic ramifications. A LCFS will promote the development of alternative fuels, which are being developed in order to reduce the nation's dependence on petroleum, reduce emissions associated with global warming. A low carbon fuel standard will evolve with emerging technologies and new crops, such as the processing of agricultural waste into cellulosic ethanol or camelina oil-seed into biodiesel. In California, where it was first introduced, LCFS was heralded as a "market-driven" approach

Electric Cars need to be considered under this section as well. They have the potential to provide exactly the same benefits as other cars, and from a supply source that everyone already has access to.

Costs to Montana consumers should be evaluated with extensive analysis. There is a growing debate about the environmental benefits of currently available low carbon fuels globally. Currently the United States produces approximately 40% of the world's corn supply.

Clear accounting with focus on reducing the carbon intensity of transportation fuels allows for innovation and favors locally produced energy.

Mfgs are providing flex fuel vehicles but we cannot purchase e85 in the state. Sad.