

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Dr. (Gerrard liddell)

Reference no: 13038

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 2050 target in legislation now

Notes

Clause

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

Position

Net Zero Emissions - Net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050

Notes

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

T become more ambitious as escalating CC dictates.

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 - the third emissions budget should be able to be changed but only when the subsequent budget is set

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

Yes

Notes

But they are far too limited and provide inadequate market signals

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**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

Makes decisions itself in respect of the number of units available 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**Clause**

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

Position

Yes

Notes**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**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**Clause**

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

Notes

NZs high transport emissions are an indictment. The NZTA Land Transport studies establish that road transport is paying less than 56% of its costs. This figure ignores the carbon cost, the QUALY cost and most importantly the road corridor costs. The moment someone steps into their car, their transport weight goes up by at least an order of magnitude (ten times). A Nissan leaf weighs a massive 1.5 tonnes. In addition they presume the right to the space of many cyclists or pedestrians. Worst vehicles presume they have paid for a road corridor they can use for their exclusive safety, reluctant to truly share the corridor they have never paid for (they only share part of the pavement costs with rate and tax payers). Until we start pricing for weight and space (congestion) so electric bikes, quadcycles and active transport have a true cost advantage, we will never get a rational efficient transport system. This will continue to distort our development with millions of tonnes of concrete and construction poured into unserviceable locations. Savings in emissions could be made from changing from white flight tribal education with 40% of peak hour traffic being children driven to school at the cost of their health, development and safety of other children using active transport. This cut emissions far more and far quicker than slow transition to heavy EV vehicles. It would cost nothing, indeed it would just save money. Leading society in these directions should be they primary role of the commission.