



**PRELIMINARY RESULTS FOR  
ASSIGNMENT OF TOP PRIORITY RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL  
OPTIONS FOR ELABORATION AND ANALYSIS**

**November 14, 2006**

David Von Hippel, Michael Lazarus, and Alison Bailie

**Preliminary Results of Voting on Priorities – as of November 14, 2006**

The tallies and comments in the table and chart below reflect the input sent in by RCI TWG members. Votes from 10 members are included here. Note that these results do not reflect “final” decisions by the TWG; we hope that they are useful in moving forward on setting priorities for detailed policy descriptions and further analysis of options.

Original Instructions for voting:

RCI TWG Members: Please enter your selections for the top priority residential, commercial and industrial-sector greenhouse gas emissions reduction options for elaboration and analysis in the table below. The rows of the table correspond to the policy options in the draft “consolidated” list of options as described in the memo on “Consolidation of Catalog of Montana RCI Options” distributed with this form. Place an “X” in the box for the top 10 options, which you feel deserve priority due to their GHG reduction potential, cost effectiveness, feasibility (both technical and political), and important additional issues (e.g. co-benefits, such as reduction of other pollutants or job creation). Only one vote can be made for each option with a total of 10. A space has also been provided for you to make comments on your selected options (for example, “Option X should be combined with Option Y”). Please save your marked and annotated ballot with a filename that includes, for example, your initials, and send it by e-mail to Michael, Alison, and David.

In a few cases, TWG members offered opinions as to the priority of options during the 10/24/06 RCI TWG call. These opinions are not reflected in the list below, but appear in the “Notes” column in the updated “Catalog of State-Level GHG Reduction Policy Options Residential, Commercial, [Government, and] and Industrial” also distributed with this form.

The overall process proposed is that the (approximately) 10 Options receiving the most votes will be designated high priority for initial analysis, and other options will be given lesser priority, but the TWG (and, ultimately, the CCAC) will have the opportunity to review the results of this balloting, and to revisit the assignment of priorities for the options, including, potentially, combining options as applicable. Please note, however, that the consolidated list of options below is still in draft form, and input on further consolidations (or changes in consolidation) is welcome.

Please provide your selections to Michael Lazarus ([mlaz@sei-us.org](mailto:mlaz@sei-us.org)), Alison Bailie ([alisonb@pembina.org](mailto:alisonb@pembina.org)), and David Von Hippel ([dvonhip@igc.org](mailto:dvonhip@igc.org)), by 11/8/2006. We will provide the results during the November 14 TWG Call.

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Vote	Comments
A.1	Demand Side Management Programs, Efficiency Funds and Requirements	8	A.1 and A.2 should be combined. / Ground Source Heat Pump Incentives are very important to encourage the efficient use of electricity and GHG emissions.
A.2	Market Transformation and Technology Development Programs	5	New base load fossil fueled generation technologies need to be developed. Hydrogen and fuel cell technologies need to be greatly advanced.
B.1	State Level Appliance Efficiency Standards and State Support for Improved Federal Standards	5	Using power more efficiently means less generation that is needed. Need additional state and federal incentives to install efficient appliances and geothermal heating & cooling. / Codes are decent, but enforcement needs work.
C.1	Building Energy Codes	8	C.1 and C.2 could be combined as "BEC and other non code related programs". / To encourage builders to be more progressive.
C.2	"Beyond Code" Building Design Incentives and Mandatory Programs	6	
C.3	Building Commissioning, Recommissioning, Retrocommissioning, and Operations Improvements	3	
C.4	Alternative Building Designs, Materials and Construction Practices	4	
C.5	Urban, Town and Subdivision Design	3	Assume this is being covered by transportation land use? Or else I would have voted for it.
D.1	Consumer Education Programs	6	Generation needs are based on how much power consumers use. Better education re. Energy efficient products means less energy being used and less generation needed. / Assume this is being covered by cross-cutting, or else I would have considered it here.
D.2	Introduce in School Curriculum	1	
E.1	Green Power Purchasing	3	Our members are" not as green as they say they are" when only 12 out of 16,000 metered service purchase green power from our Co-op.
E.2	Bulk Purchasing Programs for Energy Efficiency or Other Equipment	1	
E.3	Time of Use Rates	4	E.3 and E.4 should be combined
E.4	Tiered (inclining block) rates	2	MPC used to have this, and we should have it back.
F.1	Support for Implementation of Clean Combined Heat and Power	6	
F.2	Support for Renewable Energy Applications	5	Base load generation grow must be considered and expanded as the push for renewables accelerates.
F.3	Targeted support for specific sectors or end-uses (please indicate which)	0	
G.1	Non-Energy Emissions Reduction Initiatives	3	Automobile emission control is crucial in lowering GHGs.
G.2	Industrial Sector Emissions Cap and Trade Programs	2	
G.3	Cement Production and Blending	2	
G.4	Voluntary Emissions Reduction Measures	0	
G.5	Carbon Tax	7	Bad Idea! Our nation does not need additional costs added to already increasing energy prices. What is the cost/benefit effect of applying such a tax?

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Vote	Comments
H.1	Industrial Energy Audits and Recommended Measure Implementation	7	Could be combined with D.1
H.2	Low-income energy efficiency programs	7	The low-income consumers will struggle to pay higher energy bills related to environmental policies and additional emission taxes.
H.3	Water Use Reduction	0	

