

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Robert Glennie, **Robert Bruce Glennie**

## Reference no: 12797

**Submitter Type:** Individual

### 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

1) Restricting to carbon ignores sulphur and nitrogen based gases, among others. 2) But Net Zero is unrealistic unless there is a sea change in New Zealanders attitudes to waste and consumption in general

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions (including from new forest planting) and using some emissions reductions from overseas (international carbon units) that have strong environmental safeguards

### Notes

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

Environmental planning in New Zealand needs to be flexible about targets, not least because of unforeseen events. A large volcanic eruption from any one of our volcanoes or other volcanoes in the central and South Pacific could skewer the climate for several years - the eruption of Pinatubo (1991) was thought to have caused a drop of 0.6 degrees Celsius in the global temperature. This lasted for about two years (N.A.S.A.). A larger eruption could skewer temperatures for a decade.

### 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

10 years is a long time in a planning cycle, during which time key parameters might well change - a major disaster or technological break through may hinder a plan or suddenly give it new meaning, speaking generally but truthfully

### 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

Only if the third budget is demonstrably outmoded and that the second budget risk irrelevancy if not revisited.

### 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

### Notes

But add consideration of major climate influencing events - a large eruption could lower temperatures; large scale economic/environmental vandalism such as the mass destruction of wells such as what Saddam Hussein did in Kuwait in 1991. Whilst temporary these could have significant short term impacts.

### Clause

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

**Notes**

Some of the time frames might already be found in existing statutory planning. Provisions of R.M.A. and Local Government Act 2002 may need reviewing to determine this. Failure to set definitive timelines though will enable decisions to be continuously put off.

**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**

Economic development will continue to need to happen irrespective. See the final notes for ideas on how.

**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**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

Absolutely. If not, you might as well not bother writing it.

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

I agree something needs to be done, but I think some cold facts need to be addressed. New Zealand and other western countries are not likely to ever fully get rid of carbon based fuels. It is partially an addiction to them, but also developing nations like China and India need substantial help getting off carbon. The rest of the world needs to remain united on climate change with or without the United States. That will mean in particular developing a framework that looks acceptable to China and India using a mix of incentives such as offers of help developing sustainable forestry, scrubber technology in chimneys for factories that catch the carbon components instead of releasing them. Whilst newer cars are cleaner in terms of emissions and more efficient in terms of fuel consumption, some basic facts are ignored. For many New Zealanders they are simply too expensive. Also many New Zealanders do not have a use for stylized vehicles, especially when their existing ones are working fine - a Toyota Surf, well maintained can last 20 years or longer and have 500,000km on the clock. Thus you have a large number of Toyota Surfs, older model Holden Commodores, Ford Falcons, Subaru Legacy's still on the road. Central and local Government seem adverse to large scale energy projects that do not fit their view. If this were not the case we would probably have a Waste to Energy plant by now that could be running off our municipal waste. We could have had a tidal power station running off the tidal currents at the heads of Kaipara Harbour. Perhaps we still can, but the conservative mind frame needs to be done away with in the very near future if any of this is going to have a tangible impact by 2050.