

Web Account Policy Review - GHG discussion paper comments

From:
To: <policy@gov.ns.ca>
Date: 2009-03-31 3:03 PM
Subject: GHG discussion paper comments
CC: <morse.mla@ns.sympatico.ca>, <markparentmla@ns.aliantzinc.ca>

Dear hardworking government folks,

My MLA, the environment minister, asked me just last week if I had more questions for him when I contacted him about farmland protection.

What do you know? I do.

I'm glad you're considering time of the essence - it's evident in the feedback period on your GHG discussion paper! I'm glad I caught it in time.

Nevertheless, I don't see anything in your paper about the cumulative effects of continued coal-power generation on the concentration of airborne emissions.

I don't see any references to the rate at which these emissions are naturally sequestered.

We will still have added 95.6 MT of carbon to what's in the air now. How much of it will be hanging around in 2020?

What is the concentration of carbon dioxide in our airshed; and how quickly will it be improved by this proposed capping schedule?

A 25% percent reduction in power sector emissions is a lot, but we're going to need that 80% reduction a heck of a lot sooner than 2050.

I'll be 81, for crying out loud. How old will you be?

It is great to see the thin edge of the wedge in place for when nature's sledgehammer hits; but the number that matters is 350 ppm.

I understand that the acceptable global concentration is 350 ppm, and that we are closer to 450 ppm right now, and that we have 100 months to turn this around to avoid large-scale methane release, ocean acidification, etc.

Your capping schedule needs to remain flexible to even more aggressive caps especially if the tidal power trials are promising. We should be looking to Fundy tides as the central piece of power generation, with emphasis on in-province generation. There is no need to go further abroad, however "isolated" we may be:

At mid-tide the flow in Minas Channel equals the combined flow of all the rivers and streams on earth. (Minas Pulp & Power Co. Ltd.)

Furthermore, a more aggressive move to this type of power generation should be supplemented by some serious carrots and sticks on food transportation, which are not spelled out to any degree in your concept document: "Toward a Greener Future." I'd like to know what the barriers are around incentives for local, especially local organic food production and consumption - and corollary penalties for high-flying food; federal trade agreements? Simply encouraging people to buy local is helpful, but legislating it will bring down emissions.

I'd be happy to take your phone calls:

Sincerely,