

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Jonathan Seymour Dronfield

Reference no: 601

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?

Position

The Government sets a goal to reach net zero emissions by the second half of the century and the Climate Change Commission advises on the specific target for the Government to set later

Notes

One of the biggest issues with the global warming debate is the huge amount of conflicted science online. For every expert convinced of anthropogenic climate change there is an equally believable opposing position. I understand the NZ Government is using IPCC data and reports as the basis for potentially one of the biggest societal shifts in decades. From the get go it must be stated that the IPCC must be the most discredited organisation ever, surely. The history of the IPCC is ignominious and infamous for cherry picked data, fake reports and lies. It would be a good idea to establish a portal to present evidence in support of anthropogenic climate change resulting from increasing carbon dioxide. These data sets should be published to support specific global, regional and local claims, and allow for peer review and robust debate. We also need to acknowledge how wrong the climate models have been and remain. The position taken by this consultation promotes anthropogenic globally warming as real and the science settled. The basis for this level of confidence before tabling legislation should be easy to supply for public consumption.

Clause

2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?

Position

Net Zero Long-Lived Gases and Stabilised Short-Lived Gases - Long-lived gases to net zero by 2050 while also stabilising short-lived gases

Notes

Why assume net-zero is achievable and desirable, the status quo should be option A surely. The lack of options implies a premeditated position and a foregone conclusion.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Under the Paris Agreement, which is non-binding, we are responsible for nationally determined contributions. We write our own programme. This program must favour NZ and specifically reflect our unique geographical and social circumstances. If nations like India and Pakistan and many developing world counties can continue on an emissions growth path into the next century until reaching parity with the developed world, then we should have no qualms using the 30% of our land area covered in indigenous vegetation to sequester carbon. We should include the carbon sequestration ability of existing indigenous forests and shrubland in all carbon accounting. A paper by G.M.J.H. Hall titled Do the indigenous forests affect the net CO2 emission policy of New Zealand? 1 investigated the Kyoto compliant assumption that our indigenous forests are carbon neutral. The following sections are reproduced from the paper. "Government policy on CO2 emissions assumes the indigenous forests are "carbon-neutral", neither gaining nor losing carbon. To test this hypothesis, data were pooled from surveys, done over the last 35 years, throughout South Island and Stewart Island indigenous forests Total carbon in the above-ground stems of the South Island and Stewart Island indigenous forests was estimated at 483.1 +- 2.99 million Mg (95% CI) over 3.25 million ha of forest with an annual net loss of 1.8 +- 1.5 million Mg C yr-1. Changes are not uniform throughout the indigenous forests; loss of live-carbon is predominantly from the podocarp- broadleaved areas. Carbon losses appear to be greatest in areas impacted by large populations of introduced wild animals. The net-emission policy includes afforestation of new exotic forests to average 100,000 ha yr-1. To offset estimated mean carbon losses from the South Island and Stewart Island indigenous forests the area of plantation forest (mean approx. 13 years old) would have to be increased by 29,000 to 36,000 ha yr-1. Extending this result to all New Zealand's indigenous forests and assuming similar forest trends occur in the North Island, plantation area would have to be increased by 46,000 to 58,000 ha yr-1. These preliminary results suggest the indigenous forests could impact strongly on Government policy. " In short hand, the first additional 50,000 hectares of new afforestation will only just cover the loss of carbon from animal browsing on Indigenous forests. So, indigenous podocarp / broadleaf forest has large capacity to sequester carbon but this capacity is artificially constrained by introduced browsing. If this carbon capture could be tagged to a "Conservation carbon bond" we would have a tradeable and highly marketable mechanism to raise money for conservation. New Zealand companies could offset carbon emissions from electricity generation, transport, air travel, agriculture and mining by supporting the conservation of our forests and biodiversity. If the resultant funds were targeted directly at introduced browsing pressure in broad-leaf forests then carbon sequestration through healthily growing forests would be amplified and a good case could be made to account for this in our national carbon accounts given the unique threats faced by our indigenous

flora. To off-set this loss by planting 50,000 hectares of radiata at \$1500 per hectare would cost \$75 million. By introducing CCB's you have the potential (at \$20.00 unit) to raise \$36 million for direct predator control. We should also include the ability of New Zealand's 4,300,000 km² maritime economic zone to sequester CO₂. Given the oceans recognised role in carbon sequestration and the fact that we have a massive resource, the logical acceptance of this fact would basically nullify our emissions problem. Any balance is leading to increasing greening and plant growth and is a good thing. Promote scientific solutions to the perceived methane issue from agriculture. A vaccine is under development. Accelerate this with funding and trials, within a 15 year window to stabilise and reduce methane emissions. Do not introduce pigovian tax regimes and increase carbon tax to \$60 ton. This will do irreparable damage to our economy and the 70% of New Zealanders who can least afford it, via increasing costs of everything. Convert Huntly to run on natural gas, being the cleanest burning fossil fuel, so as to phase out thermal coal over a 20 year period. Oh wait..... Build more local scale hydro on one of the last (20) pristine rivers on the west coast. Oh wait..... Understand why consented MW capacity is failing to be built. Demonise and drive methanex and Comalco out of business. We need to be extremely careful importing a whole lot of green policy from the UK and EU, The Green Party do not have one original idea specific to NZ, they are all lifted from existing policy off shore. The UK for example has 70 million people, vastly different geography and urban mix to support public transport and a fully embedded reliance on subsidisation at every level of the economy. Do we want to introduce artificialities into our economy?

Clause

4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?

Position

Yes

Notes

If more 3 other countries, including the US reject the Paris Climate Agreement, we should automatically review the effectiveness of our targets. Also if science starts being reported in an impartial and objective, factual manner and we can have informed debate around the actual evidence of man made climate change, and the situation appears to change and favour less action, we should be open to reduce commitments.

Clause

5. The Government proposes that three emissions budgets of five years each (i.e. covering the next 15 years) be in place at any given time. Do you agree with this proposal?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

Position

Yes - each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence

Notes

Clause

7. Should the Government have the ability to review and adjust the second emissions budget within a specific range under exceptional circumstances? See p36 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you agree with the considerations we propose that the Government and the Climate Change Commission take into account when advising on and setting budgets? See p44 Our Climate Your Say

Position

No

Notes

Clause

9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?

Position

Yes

Notes

in general against the bill, but if it has to happen it is a waste of time without timeframes.

Clause

10. What are the most important issues for the Government to consider in setting plans to meet budgets? For example, who do we need to work with, what else needs to be considered?

Notes

The massive cost action is going to impose on the lower 70% of society through constant price increase in what is already one of the

most expensive places to live. The US withdrawal from Paris at a government level, has done nothing to halt the fine work the US economy is doing on emission reduction. It is noted this is led at a city level, ably and effectively without increased government legislation. We can see I believe a 25% reduction in emissions. So, emission reduction is being driven by society, technological advance, information spread, awareness and wealth creation (buying newer cars) NOT by central government imposing Pigouvian tax regimes, subsidies and welfare dependency to further entrap the lower 50% of society in the benefit swamp.

Clause

11. The Government has proposed that the Climate Change Commission advises on and monitors New Zealand's progress towards its goals. Do you agree with these functions? See p42 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

If this is done already, presumably by Ministry for the Environment and MBIE, do we really need a dedicated ivory tower built to support it. hopefully the commission would just request work from existing ministries and avoid the huge cost to taxpayers of a separate identity.

Clause

12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

Position

Advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS

Notes

Clause

13. The Government has proposed that Climate Change Commissioners need to have a range of essential and desirable expertise. Do you agree with the proposed expertise? See p45 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

Need more economists to understand the huge potentially negative implications for households. It is beyond ludicrous to assume we should subsidise a drive to zero carbon with additional benefit payments to New Zealand's disadvantaged by the states imposition of legislation most people do not want. If you ask 100 people if they are concerned about climate change, 60 will say yes. If you ask 100 people if they are prepared to adopt policies to mitigate climate change that will directly cost them to implement, 80 will say no. Economic models, even with the level of understanding and experience we have at a national level, are broad based and often out. Government surplus in 2018 were vastly different from projections even over a 2 month period. How do we have confidence in VIVID modelling of the impacts of climate change out to the second half of the century when treasury official can be so inaccurate over a timeframe of months. Models must be used as indicators of possible outcomes and should be assumed to be wrong most of the time. They should not be used as indicators of certainty with which to implement societal change.

Clause

14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?

Position

No

Notes

We have The RMA and council model. This is in desperate need of an overhaul and evidence from leaky buildings and recent subdivisions, plus the self inflicted "housing crisis" all point to the fact that any inferior legislation enforced by a disconnected bureaucracy is bound to fail. Because a huge cross over exists with local plans it is preferable to fix and empower councils through RMA reform than add a further layer of confusion to the quagmire. Perhaps now the COL government will begin to understand the desperate need for RMA reform. Central government should steer society in a general direction and stay out of the details. For 100 years wealthy people have invested in water front property because it has been deemed exclusive and desirable. This has pushed the value of this property very high. If sea level rise is real and occurs in the next 50 years at rates near your projections, water front property will be not desirable and investment will move elsewhere. Tough on the rich. Given that average annual sea level rise is something like 1.7 mm year, we may expect and 85mm increase, which is slightly lower than you anticipate. Fix the RMA first. Pay out critically affected sites once through EQC or similar and ensure the affected site is red stickered for 200 years.

Clause

15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions? See p47 Our Climate Your Say

Position

No

Notes

Clause

16. Should we explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?

Position

Yes

Notes

All branches of government need joined up thinking to shorten decision making times. The collected knowledge can also be used to help the insurance industry gut business and homeowners. .

Clause

Do you have any other comments you'd like to make?

Notes

The Paris Agreement is a hugely expensive joke and is more about the promotion of diversity and equality through the redistribution of first world wealth than climate change. We should not take it seriously to the detriment of our society when the biggest polluters continue openly on a path to ramp up emissions. Our emissions total is insignificant in the scope of things, especially when viewed in light of developing worlds attitude towards emission reduction. Our goals should reflect our significance and admit that Zero nett carbon is nice but unobtainable dream, so lets be realistic and aim for 60% reduction. We can easily meet this target by some moderate changes to agriculture to drive soil carbon capture but these would require a subsidisation model. Ie paying farmers to let land lie in fallow and develop crops for soil carbon capture. Not likely we will embrace artificial economics like subsidization though. Natural gas was one of the most effective forms of energy to assist on this pathway, zero logic in Governments decision sorry. Are we prepared to get real about the cost of bunker fuel for shipping that drives the consumer based segment of our economy, or the real cost of air travel that has massive increases in tourists projected? Doubt it. It is very easy to sort out our electricty and transition the small percentage from coal generation to hydro or geo thermal capacity. Will environmntal groups support damming of rivers if it means replacing Huntly? Is it possible to get planning consent to build a Hydro dam in the time we have left? One positive is that political ideologies may be forced to accept common ground on some issues. If we are serious about a net zero carbon future we need to disperse with many of the out-moded ideologies that pervade environmentalism. For example, the cyclone Ita legislation to salvage timber on conservation land resulted in \$40 million GDP generation, including \$1.7 million direct conservation funding. Approximately 6% of the allowable volume of timber was removed and an estimate 1/10th of 1% of the total downed biomass was removed. This is a perfect example of local community response to a massive natural event and is important in the context that New Zealand now imports \$94 million of timber and \$480 million of solid wooden furniture. Our indigenous industry produces around 4% of what our society consumes. All these imports are produced under inferior legislation and shipped to NZ using bunker fuel that does not reflect the true cost of emissions. By allowing a region like the West Coast to apply world leading resource management practices to some of its plentiful natural resources we can create regional and national wealth and offset the damage of consumer demand does globally. Try getting the limited, regulated use of windthrown timber past Eugene Sage James. Finally we are in a position where ridiculous green ideology is diametrically opposed to itself. Time for a cup of tea before the world ends.