

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Jacqueline Marie Hahn

Reference no: 10766

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

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

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Has a risk of business moving out of New Zealand, but enables a more reliable carbon price within. However there needs to be some way of accounting for imported emissions from import products to ensure a global view.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

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?

Notes

Tools for measuring aren't even up to speck yet. Emission targets/budgets to be any use have to enable a consumer to make clear choices. It will do no good if NZers buy worse emission products because they are cheaper than NZ product. Likewise farmers must be able to realize in money terms their own progress, averaging does not drive change. Same with a carbon price if researchers are indicating higher carbon prices later, people will not create carbon sinks early, unless this also has some kind of review, which will drive business offshore and make no material difference to global climate change.

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

I would say it should not rely on a government change, if a new tech or science or readjustment of the way emissions are calculated globally then changes should be made. Equally perhaps if there is a wiser/more sensible and stronger scientific reason for calculations to be done differently these should be made for New Zealanders, we should not be paying for international disagreement and we are not beholden to the agreements when they don't fully account for GHG cycling. It is important the things we do make real differences not a difference on paper only and not only as a country but ensure we don't reduce just for another more polluting country to fill the market gap.

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

Yes

Notes

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

Remember other consequences of decisions, there is a clear drive to reduce animal emissions, animal numbers when after they are stabilized have no material effect on warming. Changing dairy (sheep and beef land use change to hort would be difficult because of land type) out for Hort which is 7-10 times more damaging environmentally is mind boggling stupidity. Which means for every 100 ha you can only have 10 in vegetable horticulture for no environmental improvement. Not only that Hort is reliant on a much more stable climate than animal ag, the risk of extreme crop failures is very high with Hort, plants are not transportable around the countryside. If you think of orchards, they can be very badly hit by storms especially when blossoms are blooming, and storms, extreme weather is more likely in the future cannot understand why this is pushed as the answer in the consultation document. Most of the focus needs to go on fossil fuel, transport, what we import, how can we export cleaner, our own products impact versus globally.

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

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

All New Zealanders should have a say on an ETS, it was a big boys only game last time and unsurprisingly didn't work.

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

No

Notes

Considering Ag/hort makes up half the emissions you need Ag expertise ie federated farmers, Hort and forestry. You should have also people representing low social economic strata to ensure they are protected explain the impacts on their lives.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Adaption is what will have to happen to ensure the plants we plant, the forests we grow, the animals we grow and our ability to protect biodiversity of NZ to ensure the well-being of everyone. There needs to be some real policy on location of dwellings on flood prone areas. Whatever we do in New Zealand it is more important what the globe does, the big emitters don't seem committed so adaption is key.

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

Yes

Notes

I would like to see more action, rather than more talk. Regional Councils have been asking for help in this area yet are poorly supported by central government.

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

No

Notes

I think this could be easily done through Civil Defense no need for an additional body. As long as government has an open door policy to listening to people the flow of information will be there.

Clause

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

Notes

I don't agree with taxing, especially if it goes offshore, or is not clearly targeted to actions that improve outcomes. The more tax the less able people are to afford necessary change/the slower change can happen if they have no way of affecting their individual cost despite commitment to improve. Where other financial constraints occur eliminating sound ghg choices then the Govt has to enable the change ie electricity should not be in private hands if it is stopping reduction in energy use. Govt needs to be transparent about the money it is already collecting in electricity and fuel yet not making any change to consumer choices. Bio fuel for example should not be dearer than the normal. Cycle lanes have to be where the footpaths are not on the roads Cycle lanes should be safe for children, get the children biking then you change the future. Public transport has to get 10 fold better than it currently is we need to get cars off the roads, 78% increase in transport when our fuel costs have never been higher.