

RecordId	62
time_submitted	9/07/2010 14:31
Name	Ed Campbell
Organisation/Agency	Australian Air Quality Group
Address	49 Ash Tree Dr, Armidale, NSW 2350, Australia
Phone	61 2 67726475
Email	ausairqual@gmail.com
In favor of 4a?	No
Reason/s	Delaying the implementation of improved air quality standards comes at the expense of peoples health. Each exceedence of the air quality standard can cost lives - see for example <a href="http://aaqg.3sc.net/research-news/air-pollution-may-trigger-cardiac-arrest">http://aaqg.3sc.net/research-news/air-pollution-may-trigger-cardiac-arrest</a> It is better to keep the proposed timeline for compliance, and let regional areas which do not meet the requirements deal with the issue. Relaxing the deadline would serve towards procrastination in developing strategies to reduce pollution.
Any changes?	Yes
Suggested changes	Keep the number of exceedences of the PM10 Standard at 1 per year (excluding exceptional events). Keep deadline for compliance at 2013. Introduce monitoring and reporting of PM2.5. Include incentives to industry to work closer with the local communities to reduce pollution, eg build district heating and power units which could provide energy for the industry and local housing or community centres, replacing inefficient polluting domestic solid fuel burners.
In favor of 4b?	No
Reason/s	Removing industry consent restrictions removes any incentive to develop or use cleaner technology. There is no reason to allow more pollution in already polluted airsheds, so the policy should be to at least implement mandatory offsets. Offsets could be made positively biased instead of just causing 'new new harm', pollution overall is actually reduced.
Any changes?	Yes
Suggested changes	Adopt the Option 3 instead.
CB accurately reflected?	Yes
How can estimates be improved?	
Any overlooked costs?	
Information you'd like included	The health cost of PM needs to be realised by setting a cost towards the industry or individuals responsible for the emissions. The review should investigate the benefits of setting a tax on the main source of PM emissions, ie domestic solid fuel burners, eg by a levy on sale of solid fuel burners and firewood, and by a increased rate for households using solid fuel burners. Low income households could qualify for a rebate. The levy could pay for education of the health effects of PM. Setting a price on pollution would also directly make people more aware of the implications to the health of the community from particulate emissions, and create an incentive for replacing stoves with low-polluting heaters, and improving energy efficiency. The cost and benefits of extended low emission traffic zones in major centres should also be investigated.
Increase from 1 to 3	0
Exclude exc events	0
Mandatory offsets	0
No industry restrictions	0
Extend to 2018	0
Mandatory reporting	Yes
S 27	0
AQCS	Yes
Funding links	Yes
Other suggested amendments	Setting a standard for PM2.5 and introduction of PM2.5 monitoring and reporting. Set air quality standards based on the health effects of air pollution. Setting a tax on particulate emissions. Consider industry and government sponsored district heat and power stations. Low emission traffic zones. Better emission standards for vehicles. Continued improvement in wood burner emission standards.