

Subject: FW: Climate change submission

Recipient: zero-carbon-bill@submissions.mfe.govt.nz

Sender: ZCB.Submissions@mfe.govt.nz

Date: 23/07/2018 04:51 PM

From: Ted & Val <>
Sent: Thursday, 19 July 2018 4:35 PM
To: Climate Consultation <ZCB@mfe.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Climate change submission

From: Ted & Val |
Sent: Thursday, 19 July 2018 2:24 p.m.
To: 'ZCR@mfe.govt.nz'
Subject: Climate change submission

Hi

Now is the time to go very slowly in considering the effects of legislating agriculture into Climate Change Legislation . We have been scapegoated by much Media negativity and misunderstanding of Agriculture emissions many of which are stated as gross emissions when they should be counted as Nett emissions . We have already reduced our cow numbers (and stock numbers nationally have reduced and will fall further over time as other options for land use develop)and are careful with our fertilizer and urea programs . We get no acknowledgement for the carbon dioxide eating grasses and crops we grow , the various smaller woodlots and shelter belts scattered around the farm, riparian plantings or the carbon absorbing soils we have. There are also now thousands of QE11 covenants around the country. Also There are many many other investigations going on into new technologies and different plant species (one of which is having to be developed in the States because of GMO legislation here that is showing the potential to grow at 50% higher than conventional species giving higher energy levels , more drought resistance, more efficient water use and 23% less methane emissions) that could also have a huge impact on the emissions profile of future agriculture .

Another huge misunderstanding is around the Methane effect which is grossly exaggerated in the supposed 48% agriculture figure . This needs to be seriously re-evaluated and hopefully the scientists who do understand this better will provide the correct information to put this straight. With our falling stock numbers we surely are already at a stable position of emissions.

A recent report on NZ emissions Showed that GDP increased at 3.1% while Co2 increased at only 0.9% showing the efficiencies already being achieved. While emissions growth was 0.5% for primary Industries it was at 1.2% for goods Industries and 2.2% for service Industries. This shows that Agriculture is actually one of the best performers and needs to be not penalised under any new legislation .

Farmers are also investing millions of dollars through Dairy NZ levies and Fonterra initiatives. As a key cornerstone of the NZ economy Fonterra has its own sustainability reports and actions that we farmers actually pay for. NZ Dairy has the lowest greenhouse gas emissions in the world and so it is nonsensical to tax us when we already are world leaders in environmental management. To put more cost on us will only serve to make us less efficient and potentially drive milk production overseas to less efficient countries. 95% of supplying farms report on nutrient management and 98.4% of waterways are riparian planted . No other council , Industry or organisation could boast of such achievements! Fonterra has reduced manufacturing emissions by 5% since FY15 and aim to reduce them by 30% by 2030. Water use has also declined and targeted to reduce by 20% by 2020. Besides a huge workforce the trickledown effect to our economy and this countries people of this business is massive so does not need further needless cost when it is already known(even by Politicians) as the only Industry actually doing something positive about our environment.

The case to reduce the countries emissions seems to centre around two main potentials. The planting of trees and electric cars. In both cases neither seem to have a complete carbon trace or Quantity. The Billion trees idea is deficient in that whilst the barrel will store carbon it seems to be overlooked at the leaf fall , trimmings and stumps are all areas that rot and release carbon and the harvesting of the tree in 25years will have a negating effect on its nett contribution. The demolishing of older buildings to make way for the new construction and timber does not seem to be factored in either as these invariably finish up in a dump. There is also significant environmental damage caused when after harvesting significant rainfall occurs and soil and other erosion happens as was the case in Toliga Bay.

Electric vehicles are another case where limited notice is given . All the focus seems to be on the alternative to fuel consumption when currently I am Informed by Industry people that the carbon content required to make the batteries alone without the carbon content of the rest of the vehicle is equivalent to driving the petrol version for as long as the batteries will last before replacement – about seven to ten years . Then disposal not counted.

Therefore both of these supposed alternatives seriously need further scrutiny if we are in fact serious about affecting our emissions . Taking the above into account if a choice has to be made Option 2 seems to have the most prospect as without doubt there needs to be flexibility to change things as time rolls on and new innovations happen . Methane certainly needs to be treated as a different gas to CO2 not only for farmers sake but this Nations.

I sincerely hope that you will take much notice of sound reason and science bearing in mind that this countries emissions are only a drop in the ocean of world pollution and that our agriculture feeds up to 40 million people world wide.

Yours sincerely,
Ted Gane



Virus-free. www.avast.com