

Material printed from Royal Roads University e-Dialogues: <http://edialogues.royalroads.ca/>

Royal Roads -> ES322 - #1 Path dependance, technological lock-in and energy futures -> Welcome

Please select a range of topics for printing through to [View Topics](#) [Click here to](#)

#1: Welcome Author: Lenore Newman, Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:00 pm

Hi everyone. Tonight we are going to talk about barriers to changing our energy production and consumption patterns. The oil industry is the largest legal industrial complex on Earth- so the barriers can be formidable. They can also be subtle- such as hidden infrastructure costs. And I am going to pretend that I didn't read the posts about "Survivor". Consider this the same concept on a bigger scale.

#2: Author: Lenore Newman, Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:02 pm

Please everyone follow this thread only as we begin. I am going to start very broadly tonight as we have done this before- what barriers do people see to moving away from fossil fuels? Jump right on in.

#3: Author: Johnny, Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:04 pm

I see a fear from the public, and fueled (punn intended) by the industry that any change will be expensive and that cost will be passed on to the consumer.

#4: Author: b1jackson, Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:05 pm

MONEY MONEY MONEY. I was at Home Depot today and paid \$10 for 3 compact flourescent light bulbs. I could buy 10 of the old kind and still be able to see inside my house.

#5: Author: suegirard, Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:06 pm

I guess one of the barriers would be the structural change that would lhave to take place for any alternative that is selected.

#6: Author: cpiedt, Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:06 pm

Cost is definately one of the biggest barriers society will have to deal with.

#7: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:06 pm

I agree Johnny. It seems that everyone thinks that being "green" is expensive, however, the costs of not being enviromentally consious will likely be much higher.

#8: Author: senglish, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:07 pm

People are creatures of habit, and are often skeptical of change even when beneficial ...

#9: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:07 pm

I agree with both of these points. Industry will paint the change as expensive, and in some cases it will be, or at least will appear to be. Likely per hour the green lightbulbs work out about the same, but we tend to see "sticker shock"

#10: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:07 pm

i found an interesting figure the other day when reading about technology-lockin. The world bank has spent 24 billion dollars financing projects designed to extract, transport, process and burn fossil fuels drilled adn mined from developing countries from 1992-2002.

Now if that doesn't lead to a slow down in the R&D of new technologies, i don't know what does

#11: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:07 pm

A large fully developed infastructure, Current market paths, technological networks and politics, policies and political agendas, and cultural mindsets....not to mention \$\$ are barriers to change

#12: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:09 pm

yes Barry i just bought more CFL as well, i tried to justify the high costs by the energy savings and that they last way longer

#13: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:09 pm

bIjackson wrote:

MONEY MONEY MONEY. I was at Home Depot today and paid \$10 for 3 compact flourescent light bulbs. I could buy 10 of the old kind and still be able to see inside my house.
--

Yes, but won't you pay less in the long run (in energy costs that is) with the compact fluorescent light bulbs? That's what Leonardo DiCaprio said on Oprah. You gotta love Oprah.

#14: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:09 pm

That's right Meghan. But we are so dependant of cheap fuel that any price increase has ripples, or even waves, that go through every part of our society. Just look at all the hardships that were endured by several sectors when the price of fuel recently spiked.

Meghan King wrote:

I agree Johnny. It seems that everyone thinks that being "green" is expensive, however, the costs of not being enviromentally consious will likely be much higher.

#15: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:09 pm

Definitely, we were taling in our group discussion also about how, at least in the West, it seems that oil reserves are increasing not becoming scarce. It becomes very hard to convince people that change is needed when they cannot physically see a shortage or direct evidence of environemtnal damage.

#16: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:10 pm

Agreed Tina- the playing field is "tilted" towards oil. Fuel is kept very cheap, and of course roads are free. They don't have to be- planes and trains aren't, but just try and change that. Even conservative parties who dislike subsidies aren't going to stop underwriting the cost of highways.

#17: Author: Dawn, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:10 pm

I think cost is the big issue here too. That and time. It would take a huge investment and a long time to completely replace the current infrastructure and transition away from the use of fossil fuels. It was stated in a paper by the International Institute for Sustainable development that many investors see the transition as "combining risky markets with risky commodities".

#18: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:10 pm

Infrastructure is a large investment ... and the payback allthough positive may be long term. This may defer indutry from investing in new technologies that may not survive.

#19: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:10 pm

I was reading that one too. Seems there needs to be quite a change in the world banks initiatives to make a change. Subsidies for the oil industry were also mentioned as reasons why the industry has become as powerful as it is.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

i found an interesting figure the other day when reading about technology-lockin. The world bank has spent 24 billion dollars financing projects designed to extract, transport, process and burn fossil fuels drilled and mined from developing countries from 1992-2002.

Now if that doesn't lead to a slow down in the R&D of new technologies, i don't know what does

#20: Author: Monica, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:11 pm

Jodi seems to have summed up the major obstacles. I think it was Johnny in a previous discussion however, that pointed out that we do not see the true cost of energy at the pumps or on our statements correct? so there has to be some true number crunching so that the public is made aware the true costs of non-renewable resources.

#21: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:11 pm

Greetings all.... besides cost there is the political and economic clout of big oil.

#22: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:11 pm

Can you expand on that concept Meghan? Do you mean "west" as in western Canada? For in most parts of the world people are fretting greatly about scarce oil.

#23: Author: kristawatts, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:12 pm

I think that there is a relative lack of data standards for alternative fuels for industry. If there was the data there to provide a more attractive approach industry might be more on board. It seems that alternative fuels are simply put in an "other" category.

Hola everyone.

#24: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:12 pm

Cost and the return on investment required by companies when they invest large sums of money and expect returns over many years

#25: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:13 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Can you expand on that concept Meghan? Do you mean "west" as in western Canada? For in most parts of the world people are fretting greatly about scarce oil.

The Western Sedimentary Basin (includes AB, Sask and Northern BC) is declining. Alberta future is in heavy oil in the Northern Eastern Corner of the Province.

#26: Author: b1jackson, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:13 pm

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

b1jackson wrote:

MONEY MONEY MONEY. I was at Home Depot today and paid \$10 for 3 compact fluorescent light bulbs. I could buy 10 of the old kind and still be able to see inside my house.

Yes, but won't you pay less in the long run (in energy costs that is) with the compact fluorescent light bulbs? That's what Leonardo DiCaprio said on Oprah. You gotta love Oprah.

Can't say I like Oprah but I get your point. It's interesting the way they market the bulbs. The big huge savings numbers are right on the front in bold letters. It would leave the undecided consumer in the light bulb aisle with the dilemma....pay now "sticker shock" or pay long term with the old ones. Ever notice how cheap some alkaline batteries are now. Packs of 50 at Cdn tire for like \$5. Is there a surplus since re-chargeable or what?

#27: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:14 pm

fear stems from lack of knowledge and awareness. If the general public was better informed maybe they would be more willing to make changes--even if they start with baby steps. I noticed today that the new models of trucks are getting bigger, even as gas prices go up. I can't imagine buying one of those--even if I didn't know the negative effect they had on the environment. People say it costs too much to be green, yet they continue to buy large model vehicles???

#28: Author: Thien Tran, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:14 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

A large fully developed infrastructure, current market paths, technological networks and politics, policies and political agendas, and cultural mindsets....not to mention \$\$ are barriers to change

yes, Jodie. It would be very hard to imagine changing the fossil fuel energy infrastructure which people have built over the last century. It is costly and one would wonder the efficiency of the new alternative energy resource and system.

#29: Author: kristawatts, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:14 pm

Meghan King wrote:

Definitely, we were taling in our group discussion also about how, at least in the West, it seems that oil reserves are increasing not becoming scarce. It becomes very hard to convince people that change is needed when they cannot physically see a shortage or direct evidence of environemtnal damage.

That is so true Meghan,
It seems that this is quite a booming industry as we can not say that we are running out of this source of fuel if we simply have not found it all yet.

It would be quite easy to take an attitude like that.

#30: Author: senglish, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:15 pm

What about the extreme weather affecting crop production, and flooding towns ... hmmm

#31: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:15 pm

I was referring to Western Canada yes. It seems that the news has endless stories on the vast amounts in the oil sands, and even a recent annoucement about the offshore Hibernia reserve containing 20% more than first estimated. These types of headlines can make it hard to convince people that their is indeed a need to look for alternatives (global warming aside)

#32: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:15 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree with both of these points. Industry will paint the change as expensive, and in some cases it will be, or at least will appear to be. Likely per hour the green lightbulbs work out about the same, but we tend to see "sticker shock"

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

#33: Author: jlasuik, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:15 pm

I believe infrastructure is the biggest hurdle.

Sorry I am on a connection that is really slow, so i will try to keep up

#34: Author: jodi jane friesen, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:16 pm

Although there are some regions where new oil developments on the whole there is certainly a growing shortage to the reserves. I heard from the grapevine that last week in the news the world bank actually acknowledged the shortage of oil and the coming crisis. wonder if anyone else heard that?

#35: Author: Dawn, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:16 pm

kristawatts wrote:

I think that there is a relative lack of data standards for alternative fuels for industry. If there was the data there to provide a more attractive approach industry might be more on board. It seems that alternative fuels are simply put in an "other" category.

Hola everyone.

I think the variety of alternative technologies available may also make people fear a transition. Take transportation for example. What kind of transition will there be for refuelling stations? Should they provide biofuel, hydrogen, electric chargers, etc.? It shifts the focus away from the real issues.

#36: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:16 pm

Megan, I know what you are referring to. I do not have the stats in front of me, and I can't say that it was a reliable source (the Westjet monthly magazine that you find in your seat pocket) but it was stated that with emerging technologies (not yet discovered) that the oil reserves in Alberta are higher than anywhere else in the world right now.

#37: Author: Ann Dale, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:17 pm

And don't forget that the costs of most products now do not reflect the costs to the environment, as people assume air, land and water will just continue on ad infinitum.

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

b1jackson wrote:

MONEY MONEY MONEY. I was at Home Depot today and paid \$10 for 3 compact flourescent light bulbs. I could buy 10 of the old kind and still be able to see inside my house.

Yes, but won't you pay less in the long run (in energy costs that is) with the compact fluorescent light bulbs? That's what Leonardo DiCaprio said on Oprah. You gotta love Oprah.

#38: Author: cpiedt, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:18 pm

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

#39: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:18 pm

Meghan King wrote:

I was referring to Western Canada yes. It seems that the news has endless stories on the vast amounts in the oil sands, and even a recent announcement about the offshore Hibernia reserve containing 20% more than first estimated. These types of headlines can make it hard to convince people that there is indeed a need to look for alternatives (global warming aside)

What I find kind of humorous about that attitude is that because of free trade that oil goes into the world supply, so the price rises in Alberta as well when it rises everywhere else. An interesting hurdle though.

#40: Author: Dawn, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:19 pm

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree with both of these points. Industry will paint the change as expensive, and in some cases it will be, or at least will appear to be. Likely per hour the green lightbulbs work out about the same, but we tend to see "sticker shock"

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

I think you're right Chyann. If you market it right, and everyone else is doing it, people just seem to follow along.

#41: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:19 pm

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

#42: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:19 pm

along with the hurdle of current markets to change, are advertizing. All the adds are pushing people to buy their big SUVs at 0% financing no less.

#43: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:19 pm

[quote="kristawatts"]

Meghan King wrote:

Definitely, we were taling in our group discussion also about how, at least in the West, it seems that oil reserves are increasing not becoming scarce. It becomes very hard to convince people that change is needed when they cannot physically see a shortage or direct evidence of environemtnal damage.

So, true i work in the mining industry and when we are losing a lot of our staff to fort Mac and they claim to need an additional 100,000 + employees by 2010, its hard to convince the public that there is a shortage of fossil fuel.

#44: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:19 pm

As the price of fuel increases, it becomes more economically 'viable' to extract resources that were too expensive to extract in the past. Also, as reserves become scarcer, exploration will likely be ramped up and drive up all costs (the triple bottom line) even further.

Monica wrote:

Megan, I know what you are referring to. I do not have the stats in front of me, and I can't say that it was a reliable source (the Westjet monthly magazine that you find in your seat pocket) but it was stated that with emerging technologies (not yet discovered) that the oil reserves in Alberta are higher than anywhere else in the world right now.

#45: Author: b1jackson, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:20 pm

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree with both of these points. Industry will paint the change as expensive, and in some cases it will be, or at least will appear to be. Likely per hour the green lightbulbs work out about the same, but we tend to see "sticker shock"

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

Its that friggin' Canadian Tire guy from TV.....he could sell anything and convince you that you need everything.

#46: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:20 pm

I think it is this attitude that we will never run out that lies at the heart of the problem. If we could begin to curb consumption the transition to more and more alternative energy sources would likely be less rocky.

Ann Dale wrote:

And don't forget that the costs of most products now do not reflect the costs to the environment, as people assume air, land and water will just continue on ad infinitum.

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

b1jackson wrote:

MONEY MONEY MONEY. I was at Home Depot today and paid \$10 for 3 compact fluorescent light bulbs. I could buy 10 of the old kind and still be able to see inside my house.

Yes, but won't you pay less in the long run (in energy costs that is) with the compact fluorescent light bulbs? That's what Leonardo DiCaprio said on Oprah. You gotta love Oprah.

#47: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:20 pm

jlasuik wrote:

I believe infrastructure is the biggest hurdle.

Sorry I am on a connection that is really slow, so i will try to keep up

Infrastructure is a big hurdle. I am trying to find the numbers now, but oil sands development in Alberta will top 50 billion in the next 10 years (approx) with all the current and proposed plans. This does not include the Mackenzie Gas Project or the new pipeline from the Ft. Mac to the west coast.

#48: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:20 pm

Dawn wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

I think that there is a relative lack of data standards for alternative fuels for industry. If there was the data there to provide a more attractive approach industry might be more on board. It seems that alternative fuels are simply put in an "other" category.

Hola everyone.

I think the variety of alternative technologies available may also make people fear a transition. Take transportation for example. What kind of transition will there be for refuelling stations? Should they provide biofuel, hydrogen, electric chargers, etc.? It shifts the focus away from the real issues.

This is an interesting point. I think a lot of people get confused by the array of alternatives and the fact that no one alternative will really provide all of our needs. One of the problems is that oil is so darn convenient.

#49: Author: Ann Dale, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:21 pm

I think it is more than being influenced by the media, I think people are fed up with the bad news, and that doing good is beginning to catch on in a big way, especially when combined with fun. The waiting list for the smart car and Toyota hybrid is eight months in Ontario.

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?[/quote]

I think your right Chyann. If you market it right, and everyone else is doing it, people just seem to follow along.[/quote]

#50: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:21 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

And don't forget that the costs of most products now do not reflect the costs to the environment, as people assume air, land and water will just continue on ad infinitum.

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

b1jackson wrote:

MONEY MONEY MONEY. I was at Home Depot today and paid \$10 for 3 compact fluorescent light bulbs. I could buy 10 of the old kind and still be able to see inside my house.

Yes, but won't you pay less in the long run (in energy costs that is) with the compact fluorescent light bulbs? That's what Leonardo DiCaprio said on Oprah. You gotta love Oprah.

You bring up a good point that we considered (and I found quite enlightening) in our Environmental Economics class, in that if the sticker price of products reflected the "actual" costs to produce the item, environmentally-friendly alternatives would actually be cheaper to the consumer. This sounds like a pretty good message, the thing I'm grappling with is how do we get the price to actually reflect costs when most services provided by the environment are taken advantage of and are passed off as "free"?

#51: Author: Guest, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:22 pm

I guess this came up already but this all comes down to changing people's perception. But how do we do it?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

#52: Author: Dawn, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:22 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Meghan King wrote:

I was referring to Western Canada yes. It seems that the news has endless stories on the vast amounts in the oil sands, and even a recent announcement about the offshore Hibernia reserve containing 20% more than first estimated. These types of headlines can make it hard to convince people that there is indeed a need to look for alternatives (global warming aside)

What I find kind of humorous about that attitude is that because of free trade that oil goes into the world supply, so the price rises in Alberta as well when it rises everywhere else. An interesting hurdle though.

I was reading something similar about our natural gas reserves. We have to outbid American consumers in order to access it.

#53: Author: Ann Dale, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:22 pm

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

#54: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:23 pm

The future is a concept that present generations just have a hard time visualizing.

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

#55: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:23 pm

And if we do manage to convert to renewable sources what do we do with all the existing infrastructure

Adrian Paradis wrote:

jlauik wrote:

I believe infrastructure is the biggest hurdle.

Sorry I am on a connection that is really slow, so i will try to keep up

Infrastructure is a big hurdle. I am trying to find the numbers now, but oil sands development in Alberta will top 50 billion in the next 10 years (approx) with all the current and proposed plans. This does not include the Mackenzie Gas Project or the new pipeline from the Ft. Mac to the west coast.

#56: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:24 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Meghan King wrote:

I was referring to Western Canada yes. It seems that the news has endless stories on the vast amounts in the oil sands, and even a recent announcement about the offshore Hibernia reserve containing 20% more than first estimated. These types of headlines can make it hard to convince people that there is indeed a need to look for alternatives (global warming aside)

What I find kind of humorous about that attitude is that because of free trade that oil goes into the world supply, so the price rises in Alberta as well when it rises everywhere else. An interesting hurdle though.

Just a note on free trade and costs for gas. The last time I was in AB (couple of weeks ago) the prices were higher in Edmonton than Yellowknife.

#57: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:24 pm

One of the problems is that everything, and I mean everything, is designed for cheap oil. Per person, it takes a hundred times more energy to fly from Ottawa to Toronto than to take the train, yet the cost is about the same. This is a problem.

#58: Author: kristawatts, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:24 pm

The efficiency of technology itself is also an obstacle as the amount of miles per gallon in comparison to the output of an alternative fuel is still not up there so that it is really an incentive. It is coming but I don't think that it is there yet

#59: Author: Tammy, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:24 pm

Didn't I just hear that George Bush gave permission to drill for oil in Alaska; one of the last pristine places on earth?

That says a lot about how we value economics over the environment and how money will always be the driver when it comes to energy.

#60: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:24 pm

[quote="Johnny"]As the price of fuel increases, it becomes more economically 'viable' to extract resources that were too expensive to extract in the past. Also, as reserves become scarcer, exploration will likely be ramped up and drive up all costs (the triple bottom line) even further.

Exploration has already ramped up, it is almost impossible to find a down rig, and most alberta drilling companies are begging for new employees. I have a friend that works for one company that wanted to hire over 100 guys the other day--in one day!!

#61: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:24 pm

Certainly everyone was looking at the pumps when the oil industry was hit in New.O. I imagine the costs are astrinomial to rebuild, but will there be reinvestment in the infastructure there considering the percieved risk>

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

#62: Author: Chyann Finnigan, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:25 pm

bljackson wrote:

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree with both of these points. Industry will paint the change as expensive, and in some cases it will be, or at least will appear to be. Likely per hour the green lightbulbs work out about the same, but we tend to see "sticker shock"

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

Its that friggin' Canadian Tire guy from TV.....he could sell anything and convince you that you need everything.

You mean you don't need a super duper air compressor that cleans your car, washes dishes, and plays DVDs in the woods while out camping??? :)

#63: Author: Monica, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:25 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

I don't believe that society is completely ignorant to the seriousness of the impact of emissions, but it will take a very bold move by policy makers to turn to alternative fuel sources in a country that may not appear to have the necessity, such as Denmark recognized.

#64: Author: Dawn, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:26 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

#65: Author: Ann Dale, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:26 pm

And is anyone questioning the desirability of rebuilding beneath sea level when the majority of the world's scientists are claiming there will be sea level rising? And is anybody talking about building more sustainability?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Certainly everyone was looking at the pumps when the oil industry was hit in New.O. I imagine the costs are astrinomical to rebuild, but will there be reinvestment in the infastructure there considering the percieved risk>

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

#66: Author: Tammy, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:26 pm

I agree Meghan that we seem to have the idea that we will never run out. We just expect our resources to always be there. Even if we rationalize and know this isn't true we never seem to modify our behaviours until it is too late. Or if by chance we do modify our behaviors it always seems that we do so conservatively, so as not to offend anyone or disrupt our way of life. Pay later, not now.

#67: Author: Lenore Newman, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:27 pm

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

#68: Author: jlasuik, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:27 pm

When we talk of fear of transition at what level is there fear? The consumer, producer, provider? I dont think the fear resides with the consumer, because there are many people will to switch and are on their own means i.e biofuel is a start.

I guess the fear resides with industry losing money and maybe that's where the support is needed. Although it seems it would be best to find a way for industry to support this thmeselves so more resources and investments can be made to further a transition.

Dawn wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

I think that there is a relative lack of data standards for alternative fuels for industry. If there was the data there to provide a more attractive approach industry might be more on board. It seems that alternative fuels are simply put in an "other" category.

Hola everyone.

I think the variety of alternative technologies available may also make people fear a transition. Take transportation for example. What kind of transition will there be for refuelling stations? Should they provide biofuel, hydrogen, electric chargers, etc.? It shifts the focus away from the real issues.

#69: Author: cpiedt, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:27 pm

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree with both of these points. Industry will paint the change as expensive, and in some cases it will be, or at least will appear to be. Likely per hour the green lightbulbs work out about the same, but we tend to see "sticker shock"

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

Yes, Chyann, maybe if saving the environment was marketed as a fashionable thing to do, it might be done more!

#70: Author: Adrian Paradis, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:27 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

It is going to be very difficult. It is an ingrained concept within the North American that a car is freedom.

A 16 year old dream of his license and the its freedom. And on the opposite end, the retiree sees a car as freedom. I have had a couple of older relatives resist giving up their license. It symbolizes their freedom.

#71: Author: b1jackson, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:27 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I'd like to start with eliminating people's love of idling their cars. Drive throughs are terrible.

#72: Author: Guest, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:27 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

In North America this would be difficult, but consider Europe - I'm thinking Britain as an example - cars are small, alternative forms of transportation are abundant and gas is through the roof - nobody "fills" up their tank - they put in as much as the days trip will take them - no more. Allot of this I think this is due to infrastructures. Not alot of room with allot of people.

#73: Author: Johnny, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:27 pm

Probably not until something else better comes along to make them as fashionable as a horse and carriage. We can, however, make our cities better planned so that cars are not 'required' as much. Working from home, for example.

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

#74: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:28 pm

[quote="Meghan King"]I think it is this attitude that we will never run out that lies at the heart of the problem. If we could begin to curb consumption the transistion to more and more alternative energy sources would likely be less rocky.

I agree that is a perception lots have, but with or with out an abundance of oil, due to its effects on the environment, there still needs to be some alternatives developed that get the publics attentions and is cost effective to pursade people to make the switch

#75: Author: Chyann Finnigan, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:28 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

In short - no. It's too convenient. I'm thinking maybe not steer people away from the automobile but towards more efficient ones (so says the Echo driver that carpools her Mom to work).

#76: Author: Ann Dale, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:28 pm

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

#77: Author: Dawn, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:28 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

And is anyone questioning the desirability of rebuilding beneath sea level when the majority of the world's scientists are claiming there will be sea level rising? And is anybody talking about building more sustainability?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Certainly everyone was looking at the pumps when the oil industry was hit in New.O. I imagine the costs are astronomical to rebuild, but will there be reinvestment in the infrastructure there considering the perceived risk>

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

I think it's crazy they want to rebuild. I know there is a lot of attachment to the area, and it's hard to leave your home, but you need to be realistic. In aerial photographs of the area after the hurricane it all just looked like ocean. That should be a sign. But people are stuck in their habits. That's a huge obstacle to change of any kind.

#78: Author: Meghan King, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:28 pm

Vehicles are such an integral part of society that this will be a major hurdle.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

#79: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:28 pm

Oil is convenient and there was an awful lot of work to have the infrastructure established. I think people worry about new technologies and their reliability. People want the tried and true. That's what they want to pay for. Hard to convince people to buy an expensive technology that is just in a learning curve and is still expensive as a result.

Ann Dale wrote:

I think it is more than being influenced by the media, I think people are fed up with the bad news, and that doing good is beginning to catch on in a big way, especially when combined with fun. The waiting list for the smart car and Toyota hybrid is eight months in Ontario.

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

I think your right Chyann. If you market it right, and everyone else is doing it, people just seem to follow along.[/quote][/quote]

#80: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:30 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

I am not sure if Canada is the last great oil nation. Saudi Arabia and Russia have more conventional sources. However, Alberta's unconventional reserves does push Canada as whole over the rest of the world.

#81: Author: jalcockwhite, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:30 pm

This is a very good point...if we could just make these sorts of technologies "cool" then they might

actually take hold in the public market. I was in Vancouver a while ago and watched a smart car park with it's bumper to the curb, in between to parallel parked cars - it fit perfectly and actually gathered applause from those of us watching. The same goes for LED - definitely cool and even sold out up here in Courtenay.

Ann Dale wrote:

I think it is more than being influenced by the media, I think people are fed up with the bad news, and that doing good is beginning to catch on in a big way, especially when combined with fun. The waiting list for the smart car and Toyota hybrid is eight months in Ontario.

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

I think your right Chyann. If you market it right, and everyone else is doing it, people just seem to follow along.[/quote][[/quote]

#82: Author: Tammy, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:30 pm

I think the only way to get people away from their love affair with the automobile is by force or by offering something that is just as convenient and affordable. We are a lazy society and do not want to take transit unless it offers a lot of incentives with it. I know I love the freedom my car provides and I know the full impact of driving so how do you convince someone who doesn't even care about the environment to give it up?

#83: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:30 pm

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

#84: Author: senglish, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:31 pm

Don't forget it was the changes made to the mississippi and resultant depletion in sediment deposition that reduce the natural barriers to such a storm ... not the people living in NOLA.

#85: Author: cpiedt, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:31 pm

Tammy wrote:

Didn't I just hear that George Bush gave permission to drill for oil in Alaska; one of the last pristine places on earth?

That says a lot about how we value economics over the environment and how money will always be the driver when it comes to energy.

I don't think it got passed yet but another vote to try to pass it is supposed to take place in the New Year sometime. The crazy thing about that issue is that the recoverable oil is estimated to last only a year or two in the States.

#86: Author: Monica, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:31 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

Likely to cripple the forward search for alternatives, and again, in a nation with plenty there can be no denying the fact that the cost and convenience will dominate choice.

#87: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:31 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

And is anyone questioning the desirability of rebuilding beneath sea level when the majority of the world's scientists are claiming there will be sea level rising? And is anybody talking about building more sustainability?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Certainly everyone was looking at the pumps when the oil industry was hit in New.O. I imagine the costs are astronomical to rebuild, but will there be reinvestment in the infrastructure there considering the perceived risk>

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

Ann, i have been wondering this myself, with the devastation of the 2005 hurricane season on coastal communities will they re-build differently or will they re-build it the same as it was--for sake of ease?

#88: Author: Guest, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:31 pm

I don't think sustainability is being considered. A society needs to be rebuilt and to a certain degree at a

fairly fast pace. Since sustainability is only just beginning to be discussed, to bring it forward and hope for it to be implemented within this new New O.....well I guess it's possible.

Ann Dale wrote:

And is anyone questioning the desirability of rebuilding beneath sea level when the majority of the world's scientists are claiming there will be sea level rising? And is anybody talking about building more sustainability?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Certainly everyone was looking at the pumps when the oil industry was hit in New.O. I imagine the costs are astronomical to rebuild, but will there be reinvestment in the infrastructure there considering the perceived risk>

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

#89: Author: Dawn, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:32 pm

You make a good point Jodi. People are often cautious of taking chances when it comes to money. As long as traditional sources of energy remain inexpensive, and underpriced in comparison to their true cost, it will be difficult to transition away from them.

#90: Author: Thien Tran, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:32 pm

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

I don't know Daw. But I was taking a bus downTown few day ago. I quite impressed with the public transportation with new design and stting space! On the long run or commute to work every morning may be tough to think of. But we can see the improvement in the public services to encourage people to take public transportation; thus, helping reducing GHG effect.

#91: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:33 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

I think this goes back to the point where alternatives do not seem to meet all our needs in certain societies.

#92: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:33 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

#93: Author: ewaterman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:33 pm

hello everybody,

holy things are moving along so fast i can't keep up reading. sorry i'm late.

i think a major barrier is the inconvenience of change.....to develop a new infrastructure away from fossil fuels is going to be inconvenient at first. here is an example, i am in winnipeg right now and we just got 2 feet of snow in 1 day....i don't have a vehicle so i am taking the bus and walking.....before there was a "trail" on the sidewalk for pedestrians we had to walk on the street in traffic. and the buses were up to 2 hours late...it would have been more convenient to drive and not save fossil fuels. how do we convince people driving is bad if it is just so good!

#94: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:34 pm

This is definitely an attractive vision. I know if we had trains like they do in Europe I much prefer to travel that way.(No treacherous winter driving, or windshield scraping). But again so much infrastructure would be needed to make this a reality

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

#95: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:34 pm

I dont think people ever truely get over a love affair untill they fall in love again.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

#96: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:34 pm

Wasn't it fashionable to save the environment a few years back. I remember all the campaigning over saving the rain forest and the earth days and how cool it was to be an earth loving granola cruncher (no offense intended anyone; it is still cool). What happened to all of the media attention? We are still loosing our rain forests and facing huge environmental problems. Did people just loose momentum and interest?

#97: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:34 pm

Does the US not hold oil reserves in some hide out somewhere ...just in case. I think that I read somewhere that it was a way of controlling costs by not flooding the market?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

#98: Author: jlasuik, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:35 pm

I would think the existing infrastruture will still be used for transporation etc.. Why not continue to use the fueling statins etc as we already do for another energy source. We won't be able to much will all the contaminanted land due to gas stations. None the less I think if the switch is made people will be creative and find a way to make a profit.

Meghan King wrote:

And if we do manage to convert to renewable sources what do we do with all the existing infrastructure

Adrian Paradis wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

I believe infrastructure is the biggest hurdle.

Sorry I am on a connection that is really slow, so i will try to keep up

Infrastructure is a big hurdle. I am trying to find the numbers now, but oil sands development in Alberta will top 50 billion in the next 10 years (approx) with all the current and proposed plans. This does not include the Mackenzie Gas Project or the new pipeline from the Ft. Mac to the west coast.

#99: Author: Johnny, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:35 pm

And, can you think of a better way for Canada to assert its sovereignty over the North by opening up exploration in the Canadian Arctic - Given that a few posts ago some were saying that we are becoming a world power in oil!

cpiedt wrote:

Tammy wrote:

Didn't I just hear that George Bush gave permission to drill for oil in Alaska; one of the last pristine places on earth?

That says a lot about how we value economics over the environment and how money will always be the driver when it comes to energy.

I don't think it got passed yet but another vote to try to pass it is supposed to take place in the New Year sometime. The crazy thing about that issue is that the recoverable oil is estimated to last only a year or two in the States.

#100: Author: jalcockwhite, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:35 pm

That's exactly what I was wondering. Considering how many hurricanes there have been so far - and considering the prediction for even more next year - how is it that New Orleans is being rebuilt? The cost involved must be astronomical. Has anyone in charge considered putting the money to building sustainable architecture. You have to wonder what "they" are thinking.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

And is anyone questioning the desirability of rebuilding beneath sea level when the majority of the world's scientists are claiming there will be sea level rising? And is anybody talking about building more sustainability?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Certainly everyone was looking at the pumps when the oil industry was hit in New.O. I imagine the costs are astronomical to rebuild, but will there be reinvestment in the infrastructure there considering the perceived risk>

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

I think it's crazy they want to rebuild. I know there is a lot of attachment to the area, and it's hard to leave your home, but you need to be realistic. In aerial photographs of the area after the hurricane it all just looked like ocean. That should be a sign. But people are stuck in their habits. That's a huge obstacle to change of any kind.

#101: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:35 pm

While we are talking I thought I just post this. Just posted moments ago. I was looking for the Article on the Alaska Slopes Drilling.

Source CBC North:<http://www.cbc.ca/north/story/feds-pipeline-17112005.html>

Ottawa removed some of the last hurdles facing the proposed \$7 billion Mackenzie Valley Gas project on Thursday, telling the project proponents it would consider taking on some of the project's risk... if it would get a greater share of its rewards.

In a letter to the head of Imperial Oil, deputy prime minister Anne McLellan says Ottawa isn't prepared to subsidize construction of the pipeline.

But the government will look at royalties and the possibility of investing in the project.

Ottawa would "consider assuming a greater share of the project downside risks provided it is able to increase its share in the potential financial rewards," she said.

Under the proposed system, the consortium would pay lower royalties to Ottawa until the pipeline was paid for.

"We are willing to consider the request for fiscal enhancements but anything that we do has to be commercially viable and... cannot be a subsidy," McLellan said.

Ottawa is also considering a federal loan guarantee for the Aboriginal Pipeline Group's portion of project expenses.

The guarantee would increase the APG's earnings in the project by reducing the costs of borrowing money.

The letter was welcomed by pipeline proponents.

"It would be fair to say that these assurances would lead us to believe that our concerns on fiscal

terms have been largely addressed," Imperial spokesman Pius Rohleiser said.

Imperial Oil had said it hoped to reveal by Friday whether it was ready for a series of conferences leading up to public hearings.

On Thursday, however, the company said it will let the National Energy Board know next Wednesday whether it's ready to proceed.

#102: Author: Monica, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:36 pm

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

Interesting that you bring up Uranium. I was listening to CBC radio in Saskatchewan a couple weeks ago, and there seems to be a very interesting debate regarding the disposal of radioactive waste. How can we depend on resource with no plan in place on how to dispose of it's byproducts???

#103: Author: Dawn, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:37 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I'll make sure to check ou that book. I agree that we need a total transition, but the concept poses alot of obstacles. One thing I was thinking is what would we do with all of the vehicles? The metal could be recovered, but there would be alot of waste and expense. In the big picture it would probably cost less than maintaining the existing transportation system, but decisions seem to be made with a limited scope many times.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

#104: Author: cpiedt, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:37 pm

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

We'll get away from the automobile only when we have our own mini personal airplains

#105: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:38 pm

[quote="Ann Dale"]Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

#106: Author: ewaterman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:39 pm

i don't think we need reasonable alternatives, i think we need over the top alternative to get people to drive less. the alternatives have to so good they are to hard to turn down....the total opposite.

#107: Author: jalcockwhite, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:39 pm

I think this has fallen out of fashion, although I'm not sure why. The tent in Cathedral Grove is still intact, the signs are up to save the trees from the impending parking lot, but most people look at the hippies in disdain. I'm not sure what the majority of people think but I think the hippies need to come up with a new way of representing themselves and their opinions. We need a new environmental movement that is based more on true science and facts than on peace and love. Sadly.

Anonymous wrote:

Wasn't it fashionable to save the environment a few years back. I remember all the campaigning over saving the rain forest and the earth days and how cool it was to be an earth loving granola cruncher (no offense intended anyone; it is still cool). What happened to all of the media attention? We are still loosing our rain forests and facing huge environmental problems. Did people just loose momentum and interest?

#108: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:39 pm

If there is still alot of money to be made it will probalby be a major obstical. However, it seems Canada prides itself as being a leader in technology. If there is a market to fill for new technologies I think canada will use the brian power we have to actualize it. The oil prices will still go up and we will probably just pump our oil to the states for almost free and buy it back for big bucks...that might just keep the tecnology scene moving ahead.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

#109: Author: suegirard, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:39 pm

Nice one.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I dont think people ever truely get over a love affair untill they fall in love again.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Do you think that we can ever get people away from their love affair with the automobile?

I don't know Anne, but I hope so. This is something I'm struggling with right now. It's amazing how fast you become "dependant" on a vehicle.

#110: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:40 pm

Maybe should should rebuid it like Venice :) Seriously though, I was thinking that if they are going to rebuild an entire city, they have a great oppotunity to do it right (but perhaps somewhere else).

jalcockwhite wrote:

That's exactly what I was wondering. Considering how many hurricanes there have been so far - and considering the prediction for even more next year - how is it that New Orleans is being rebuilt? The cost involved must be astronomical. Has anyone in charge considered putting the money to building sustainable architecture. You have to wonder what "they" are thinking.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

And is anyone questioning the desirability of rebuilding beneath sea level when the majority of the world's scientists are claiming there will be sea level rising? And is anybody talking about building more sustainability?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Certainly everyone was looking at the pumps when the oil industry was hit in New.O. I imagine the costs are astrinomial to rebuild, but will there be reinvestment in the infastructure there considering the percieved risk>

Ann Dale wrote:

What about the costs of the recent hurricanes, and let's look at the example of rebuilding New Orleans?

cpiedt wrote:

Another thing we talked about in our team discussion was that people don't understand the seriousness of CO2 emissions from current fossil fuel consumption. There may be less resistance to change if they really understand the future impacts.

I think it's crazy they want to rebuild. I knwo there is alot of attachment to the area, and it's hard to leave your home, but you need to be realistic. In aerial photographs of the area after the hurricane it all just looked like ocean. That should be a sign. But people are stuck in their habits. That's a huge obstacle to change of any kind.

#111: Author: kristawatts, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:40 pm

Monica wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

Interesting that you bring up Uranium. I was listening to CBC radio in Saskatchewan a couple weeks ago, and there seems to be a very interesting debate regarding the disposal of radioactive waste. How can we depend on resource with no plan in place on how to dispose of it's byproducts???

Toxic waste factor is brutal. I guess I get really confused at the point that people keep including nuclear energy as an attractive alternative as the amount of uranium is finite and essentially back into a nonrenewable resource.

#112: Author: Adrian Paradis, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:40 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Does the US not hold oil reserves in some hide out somewhere ...just in case. I think that I read somewhere that it was a way of controlling costs by not flooding the market?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

The US maintains a couple of reserves throughout the country for times of emergency. Bush opened them during the hurricanes to reduce the cost of oil. There are also reserves near ANWR(Alaska) that are not being drilled at the moment. If you look at a map of the North Slope and go west of the Conoco Phillips / Anadarko facility there is a reserve that has not been tapped yet.

It is not mentioned when the talk about ANWR.

#113: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:40 pm

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

#114: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:40 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

Ah, but Lenore, now we're talking about complete lifestyle changes. Correct me if I'm wrong but from what I gather of Italians, they take their personal time seriously and don't live to punch the clock at work. They slow down to the speed of life where us North Americans seem to be caught in the rat-race that our daily lives have become. If I get off from work at 5:00pm and have to go home, cook dinner, do homework, chores, etc. I think the choice of a 15 minute car ride over a 1 hr bus ride will win everytime. In Italy, it may be a slower lifestyle where people enjoy life and work to live rather than live to work. We're talking about changing peoples complete attitudes and outlooks towards the world they've developed in the North American culture. Ok, I digress but I think this issue is bigger than just choosing a car over a bus ride.

By the way, I too love Venice (although I've have yet to go). I envy their lifestyle choices and their "zest for life".

#115: Author: Andrew Marshall, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:40 pm

I agree with many of you that the biggest barrier is the fear and costs associated with changing energy sources. However, I think the key in overcoming this barrier is to establish incentives for

industry and the public to recognize that the current practices are not sustainable.

#116: Author: jlasuik, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:40 pm

I question the use of `needs` rather it is wants??. Our lifestyles want convenience when it can be much healthier without it. i.e fast food

Monica wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

I think this goes back to the point where alternatives do not seem to meet all our needs in certain societies.

#117: Author: senglish, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:41 pm

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

Fortunately we have other options as well, renewables, the advent of technology, and sense of necessity brought on by global warming will hopefully improve battery or fuel cell technology to the point of practicality.

#118: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:41 pm

[quote="Lenore Newman"]

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name

would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

I have to say one thing I have always thought about the smart car, is how do you transport a family around in a smart car. If you consider that there are many households trying to get by with one vehicle, due to the rising costs of driving, the smart car just doesn't seem to be a logical choice in such a situation.

#119: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:41 pm

Monica wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

Interesting that you bring up Uranium. I was listening to CBC radio in Saskatchewan a couple weeks ago, and there seems to be a very interesting debate regarding the disposal of radioactive waste. How can we depend on resource with no plan in place on how to dispose of it's byproducts???

I guess that is part of the ongoing debate, before developing more infrastructure, particularly in Sask, they want to develop a better disposal plan first. I am certain the public will not allow for the development of uranium facilities without this.

Its seems to be a full circle topic, there is a big push on developing nuclear reactors, so we can supply power to the overgrowing community of Fort Mac, so they can continue to produce oil. It seems that their infrastructure can't keep up iwth the population growth and they can't find workers to build them the infrastructure

#120: Author: Dawn, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:43 pm

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

I know Ontario seems to be putting a pretty strong focus on nuclear. The Atomic Energy and Control Board has commercials on all the time about this "emissions free", "clean" energy source. Steve, you've probably seen them. What I think is funny is that almost 50% of Ontario's energy is supplied by nuclear, and you can't find anything about it on the Ontario Ministry of Energy website.

#121: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:43 pm

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Monica wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

Interesting that you bring up Uranium. I was listening to CBC radio in Saskatchewan a couple weeks ago, and there seems to be a very interesting debate regarding the disposal of radioactive waste. How can we depend on resource with no plan in place on how to dispose of it's byproducts???

I guess that is part of the ongoing debate, before developing more infrastructure, particularly in Sask, they want to develop a better disposal plan first. I am certain the public will not allow for the development of uranium facilities without this.

Its seems to be a full circle topic, there is a big push on developing nuclear reactors, so we can supply power to the overgrowing community of Fort Mac, so they can continue to produce oil. It seems that their infrastructure can't keep up iwth the population growth and they can't find workers to build them the infrastructure

Fort McMurray, Alberta. There's a perfect example of an unsustainable community!!

#122: Author: Lenore Newman, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:43 pm

Chyann, you are right about lifestyles. I guess I feel we could take the best of Europe. I fell in love with metros that go everywhere and trains where you sit in a restaurant getting drunk while zooming along at 300km an hour. But Ann is right- these things cost BIG TIME. However so do roads, so we do have choices here.

#123: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:44 pm

Sorry, about the previous post my finger slipped.

Anyhow, I think transit could use some help in the marketing area to make it "cool". The car industry has overwhelmed us with images associating nice vehicles with status. We see people with nice cars and assume they are "cool" and that they are well off. We see nice cars as extremely desirable and it will take a lot to deter people from the idea that this isn't necessarily true.

Perhaps if it became "cooler" to ride the bus you would see more kids opting for it than saving every last penny to buy a car. But Lenore is right too in saying that they need to improve the convenience of the transit system dramatically if it is every to take its proper place in our society.

#124: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:44 pm

By the way, if "guest" is a student please give me your name so that I can record your stuff. If not, don't worry about it. Unless you are an oil industry spy!

#125: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:45 pm

And I remember in the 'old days' that engineering students would hang their professors' VW Bug off a bridge or something. Also, motorcycles are light too but there isn't a big run on walking off with those. I am not sticking up for the Smart Car either, because they have issues too.

[quote="Lenore Newman"]

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the ads "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

#126: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:45 pm

I think nuclear power is a good example of how we must be careful in our development of alternatives because we don't want to jump on a bandwagon to find out that it has even worse implications than fossil fuels and global warming

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Monica wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Yes, it is rather interesting that Canada will be the last great oil nation. Unexpected for our humble country, and perhaps it will hamper our ability to be a leader in looking for alternatives.

not only does Canada have the oil but also the uranium, with a push to develop alternative modes of energy it will be interesting to see which resource will be focused on?

Interesting that you bring up Uranium. I was listening to CBC radio in Saskatchewan a couple weeks ago, and there seems to be a very interesting debate regarding the disposal of radioactive waste. How can we depend on resource with no plan in place on how to dispose of it's byproducts???

I guess that is part of the ongoing debate, before developing more infrastructure, particularly in Sask, they want to develop a better disposal plan first. I am certain the public will not allow for the development of uranium facilities without this.

Its seems to be a full circle topic, there is a big push on developing nuclear reactors, so we can supply power to the overgrowing community of Fort Mac, so they can continue to produce oil. It seems that their infrastructure can't keep up iwth the population growth and they can't find workers to build them the infrastructure

#127: Author: suegirard, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:46 pm

[quote="Lenore Newman"]

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

Great comment Lenore, and it made me think - today I was almost in an accident. Wouldn't have been bad for me - since I was driving a large/high truck but for the person who was in the small car - the passenger's head was right in line with the middle of my grill. Other person's potential fault by the way - but - this is one of the reason's that I don't like small cars. Yikes scarry....

#128: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:46 pm

I'm surprised Barry hasn't mentioned the wind turbines proposed for Summerside in PEI. Such a cute and innovative little Island!

#129: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:46 pm

Quite true about nuclear. It has that huge "yes but" factor that Ann and I know far too well.

#130: Author: Tammy, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:46 pm

I don't think it could be better said Jodi than we need to find a new love before we give up our old one.

#131: Author: Andrew Marshall, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:47 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

Yes I think this is big problem Ann. Decisions these days are heavily influenced by the global market, and therefore we look to see what others are doing to solve their problems instead of thinking of our own ways to resolve the issue.

#132: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:48 pm

Barry has been telling us about a few initiatives in PEI in our group. It seems that they are really taking some action there. Hopefully we can apply some of their examples on the larger scale

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

I'm surprised Barry hasn't mentioned the wind turbines proposed for Summerside in PEI. Such a cute and innovative little Island!

#133: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:48 pm

I am still completely amazed that there has not been major advancements in public transportation. The busses are so crowded in cities its uncomfortable, you have to wait, you try to be concious and you are late. there are no parking places but sometimes you still have to drive to get somewhere. It makes no sence to me why this need isnt being filled.

Ann Dale wrote:

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

#134: Author: Chyann Finnigan, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:49 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Chyann, you are right about lifestyles. I guess I feel we could take the best of Europe. I fell in love with metros that go everywhere and trains where you sit in a restaurant getting drunk while zooming along at 300km an hour. But Ann is right- these things cost BIG TIME. However so do roads, so we do have choices here.

If we could take the best of Europe (wine, cheese, scenery, architecture, history, etc) I think we'd all be better off! :)

#135: Author: jlasuik, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:49 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

I agree. It starts small -most always does. Innovation happens and then we see corporate buy-outs.

#136: Author: Jalcockwhite, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:49 pm

Hmm, now this is a very interesting point. Changing the lifestyles of those stuck in the rat race. People talk about it all the time - how they'd love to retire early and just enjoy life. Don't we all have that option? Sure, but North America has really been built around a set of values of which employment, the house, car, spouse and kids are at the top. How do we change these values? The European lifestyle has much more time to develop and is based on certain cultural values. In our multicultural society that depends so much on immigration, it may be hard to change this. So many people are coming to our cities looking for a better life - how would you tell them they buying a car is bad, when they are trying to live the American Dream?

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

Ah, but Lenore, now we're talking about complete lifestyle changes. Correct me if I'm wrong but from what I gather of Italians, they take their personal time seriously and don't live to punch the clock at work. They slow down to the speed of life where us North Americans seem to be caught in the rat-race that our daily lives have become. If I get off from work at 5:00pm and have to go home, cook dinner, do homework, chores, etc. I think the choice of a 15 minute car ride over a 1 hr bus ride will win everytime. In Italy, it may be a slower lifestyle where people enjoy life and work to live rather than live to work. We're talking about changing peoples complete attitudes and outlooks towards the world they've developped in the North American culture. Ok, I digress but I think this issue is bigger than just choosing a car over a bus ride.

By the way, I too love Venice (although I've have yet to go). I envy their lifestyle choices and their "zest for life".

#137: Author: ewaterman, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:49 pm

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

Ah, but Lenore, now we're talking about complete lifestyle changes. Correct me if I'm wrong but from what I gather of Italians, they take their personal time seriously and don't live to punch the clock at work. They slow down to the speed of life where us North Americans seem to be caught in the rat-race that our daily lives have become. If I get off from work at 5:00pm and have to go home, cook dinner, do homework, chores, etc. I think the choice of a 15 minute car ride over a 1 hr bus ride will win everytime. In Italy, it may be a slower lifestyle where people enjoy life and work to live rather than live to work. We're talking about changing peoples complete attitudes and outlooks towards the world they've developped in the North American culture. Ok, I digress but I think this issue is bigger than just choosing a car over a bus ride.

By the way, I too love Venice (although I've have yet to go). I envy their lifestyle choices and their "zest for life".

maybe that is what we have to do, totally change the infrastructure of our lifestyles. this is kinda tying in with our policy analysis class in chapter 4 it is discussing instuments and indirestly conditioning behaviour to introduce or intise people to change through changing their thoughts. an example of this is to put nasty pictures and quotes on the cigarette packages. picture this: a guy driving his car with a big red face all stressed out and a person sitting on the bus so relaxed its like having your slippers on with your feet up at home reading a newspaper while someone else is fighting traffic. makes me feel calmer already

#138: Author: Guest, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:50 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Chyann, you are right about lifestyles. I guess I feel we could take the best of Europe. I fell in love with metros that go everywhere and trains where you sit in a restaurant getting drunk while zooming along at 300km an hour. But Ann is right- these things cost BIG TIME. However so do roads, so we do have choices here.

It is really all upto our city planners as they are setting the direction 10 and 20 years out ... more box stores with no residential in sight - cars are becoming if not already indispensable

#139: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:50 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

By the way, if "guest" is a student please give me your name so that I can record your stuff. If not, don't worry about it. Unless you are an oil indistry spy!

I feel a SLAPP suit coming on...for heaven sakes no one name names!

#140: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:51 pm

Andrew Marshall wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

Yes I think this is big problem Ann. Decisions these days are heavily influenced by the global market, and therefore we look to see what others are doing to solve their problems instead of thinking of our own ways to resolve the issue.

I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

#141: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:51 pm

I think we have to be careful about talking about the minority actions, and developing policies on that basis. I find that the two factors people use for avoiding change are safety and security, think of your IT people when you want to use open source, they evoke security. With respect to safety, the safe car has some very interesting design features, it has the safety specs of a mid-size Mercedes, regardless of its tippiness. With respect to road handling, it is also exceptionally stable. In Victoria, they are allowed to park for free, smart cars.

[I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"[/quote][[/quote]

#142: Author: cpiedt, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:51 pm

[quote="Lenore Newman"]

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

Sorry, I accidentally pressed reply to this post and it seems I have to submit this in order to be able to reply to other posts

#143: Author: Tammy, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:51 pm

I made a few of the guest comments but not all of them. The finger slipped one is mine in particular. Sorry.

#144: Author: Guest, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:52 pm

Monica wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

I think this goes back to the point where alternatives do not seem to meet all our needs in certain societies.

I agree Lenore our love affair with cars is more like a shot gun marriage. We need cars and i'm all for cheeper more fuel efficient ones

I seem to be having a bit of a problem here, the post do not reconize my login Name

#145: Author: kristawatts, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:52 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Sorry, about the previous post my finger slipped.

Anyhow, I think transit could use some help in the marketing area to make it "cool". The car industry has overwhelmed us with images associating nice vehicles with status. We see people with nice cars and assume they are "cool" and that they are well off. We see nice cars as extremely desirable and it will take a lot to deter people from the idea that this isn't necessarily true.

Perhaps if it became "cooler" to ride the bus you would see more kids opting for it than saving every last penny to buy a car. But Lenore is right too in saying that they need to improve the convience of the transit system dramatically if it is every to take its proper place in our society.

It seems so clear that the media has such a powerful way to direct people's choices and lifestyle changes unfortunately media appears to be so controlled by the market and catastrophic events that it appears that there in itself lies a barrier.

I have to go now as I have a 6 hour drive home and I have to work tomorrow so Great Discussion everyone. I will see you tomorrow night....Same time Same place.

Cheers, Krista :-)

#146: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:54 pm

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

#147: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:54 pm

The public transit system in Venice is awesome as well. Water taxis, ferries, Gondolas. I got around just fine, and found everywhere I wanted to go by riding in uncrowded comfort.

ewaterman wrote:

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

Ah, but Lenore, now we're talking about complete lifestyle changes. Correct me if I'm wrong

but from what I gather of Italians, they take their personal time seriously and don't live to punch the clock at work. They slow down to the speed of life where us North Americans seem to be caught in the rat-race that our daily lives have become. If I get off from work at 5:00pm and have to go home, cook dinner, do homework, chores, etc. I think the choice of a 15 minute car ride over a 1 hr bus ride will win everytime. In Italy, it may be a slower lifestyle where people enjoy life and work to live rather than live to work. We're talking about changing peoples complete attitudes and outlooks towards the world they've developed in the North American culture. Ok, I digress but I think this issue is bigger than just choosing a car over a bus ride.

By the way, I too love Venice (although I've have yet to go). I envy their lifestyle choices and their "zest for life".

maybe that is what we have to do, totaly change the infrastructure of our lifestyles. this is kinda tying in with our policy analysis class in chapter 4 it is discussing instuments and indirestly conditioning behaviour to introduce or intise people to change through changing their thoughts. an example of this is to put nasty pictures and quotes on the cigarette packages. picture this: a guy driving his car with a big red face all stressed out and a person sitting on the bus so relaxed its like having your slippers on with your feet up at home reading a newspaper while someone else is fighting traffic. makes me feel calmer already

#148: Author: Tammy, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:55 pm

I believe diversification will play a key role in solving our energy crisis. As Anne mentioned, why do we have to do it in a way that is all or nothing. Why can't we slowly integrate new systems to minimize our risks and costs but continually move to resources that are less environmentally damaging.

I also think diversification will be key, because with any resource if you use it too much you create environmental problems that continue to grow and grow. If we have several options we will minimize our impact and can alternate our use to give the environment time to adjust and recover.

#149: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:55 pm

I agree Monica, like the people that have a smart car to go to the store, the van to transport things or holidays and the mercedes to go out...really. It just isnt a convenient car for alot of households...and do you ever really fall in love with the smart car, except when you gloating about your park job.
[quote="Monica"]

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

I have to say one thing I have always thought about the smart car, is how do you transport a family around in a smart car. If you consider that there are many households trying to get by with one vehicle, due to the rising costs of driving, the smart car just doesn't seem to be a logical choice in such a situation.

#150: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:55 pm

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obstacles we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource. [/quote]

#151: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:56 pm

i find it interesting that we compare our lifestyle to the europeans and that because our lifestyle is so fast that it is difficult to change infrastructure. so, if this is the case we have to change our lifestyles or the perception of priorities, how do you change so many millions of peoples life attitudes. I am sure if people spent some time living a more laid back, slower lifestyle they would find it more enjoyable, but for it to have any effect the change has to be all encompassing

#152: Author: Andrew Marshall, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:56 pm

I heard an incentive that Vancouver has just designed that I think is a step in the right direction anyway. In the downtown core of the city, any person who drives a Smart Car gets parking for half the regular price. This is a cool idea because it makes the effort in lowering the number of gas guzzling vehicles on the road.

#153: Author: Thien Tran, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:56 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Sorry, about the previous post my finger slipped.

Anyhow, I think transit could use some help in the marketing area to make it "cool". The car industry has overwhelmed us with images associating nice vehicles with status. We see people with nice cars and assume they are "cool" and that they are well off. We see nice cars as extremely desirable and it will take a lot to deter people from the idea that this isn't necessarily true.

Perhaps if it became "cooler" to ride the bus you would see more kids opting for it than saving every last penny to buy a car. But Lenore is right too in saying that they need to improve the convenience of the transit system dramatically if it is every to take its proper place in our society.

Hi guest,

Is that most high school kids call bus riders are "loser cruiser crowns"? Anyhow, I do agree with you if the transit services system improved by the looks, and more bus schedule on routes then may be more people will consider to take the bus to reduce their own driving times. I recall Montreal is having the best bus routes that the more residential rates/community then bus would run more especially during rush hours. And Metro was great way to go downtown to work or to universities. Other cities should consider faster systems (expressed train, bus ...) to take people then the situation will improve.

#154: Author: suegirard, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:57 pm

There was an article in the newspaper couple of weeks back discussing the recent CN/CP mishaps in several areas of the province - spills, trains jumping tracks. This publicity is not good for alternative forms of transportation such as rails although in the scheme of the the number of trains actually travelling on the tracks - this accidents are probably comparable to highway accidents.

On the same line - there was also a discussion regarding why there is a need to restructure/rebuild the highways to Whisltter for the 2010 Olympics when a train track was already in place that could handle visitors from Vancouver to Whistler. I guess this comes back to your comment Ann regarding our love affair with our cars.

Ann Dale wrote:

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

#155: Author: jalcockwhite, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:57 pm

How many wind turbines are they operating? Do you know how much energy they are able to produce? And are there any local cooperatives that own shares in the turbines - like the Danish model. This seems to me to be a really good idea to gain public support.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

#156: Author: Lenore Newman, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:58 pm

I agree that diversity could play a large role, and could help get rid of some of the fear of the new. If people were given more choices they might be willing to experiment, knowign that no one was going to tear down all of the suburbs while they tried out a condo in the city. Diversity might be a key.

#157: Author: Johnny, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:58 pm

Some comments on Smart Cars, compiled by a colleague: The following summarizes the information available on diesel vehicles and, more specifically, the Smart Car:

- Diesel vehicles are generally more fuel efficient than comparable gasoline vehicles.
- The greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from diesel vehicles are about 20% lower than most comparable gasoline vehicles.
- However, there are significantly higher air emissions (e.g. particulate matter and nitrogen oxide) from diesel vehicles than from gasoline vehicles. Diesel particulate matter is very fine, making it very easy to inhale. Some government agencies have classified it as either a "human carcinogen" or "probable human carcinogen". (http://www.nett.ca/faq_diesel.html)
- The United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Green Vehicle Guide scores vehicles based on air pollutant emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and fuel efficiency. (<http://www.epa.gov/autoemissions/>)
- Natural Resources Canada's Fuel Consumption Guide scores vehicles based on fuel efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions. (<http://oee.nrcan.gc.ca/transportation/tools/fuel-consumption-guide/fuel-consumption-guide.cfm?attr=8>)
- The Smart Car does not appear on the EPA list because they are not being sold in the US. However, all small diesel vehicles that appear on the list (e.g. Volkswagen Golf and Volkswagen Jetta) rank very poorly in terms of air pollutant emissions and therefore score lower overall than their gasoline equivalents.
- The Smart Car ranks 3rd overall on the NRCan list for fuel efficiency, but that list does not take air emissions into account. The CO2 emissions for the Smart Car are higher than for the Honda Insight (#1) or the Toyota Prius (#2), which are hybrid-electric vehicles. The Honda Civic hybrid also ranks high in NRCan's rating (#4) and the US EPA rating.
- Although the Smart Car has been approved for sale in Canada, it has been classified as meeting the lowest acceptable air quality emissions standard, which is the Tier 2 "bin 10" US EPA Emissions Standard. In the US, vehicles are ranked in bins from 1 to 10, with bin 1 being the best. The Tier 2 standards came into effect in 2004 and have cleaner emissions standards than Tier 1. The EPA will be eliminating bins 9 and 10 in 2007, and the minimum emission standards for sale in the United States will be raised. Canadian federal emission requirements and test procedures for on-road vehicles are currently aligned with the EPA standards and are likely to continue to be aligned with those of the EPA.
- The federal Sulphur in Diesel Fuel Regulations (pursuant to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act) will reduce the sulphur concentration limits for diesel fuel from 500 mg/kg to 15 mg/kg starting in mid-2006. As a result, the 2007 models of the Smart Car and other diesels should have lower air emissions than the current models.
- The best approach when deciding which vehicle to buy is to choose one that ranks high for fuel efficiency, greenhouse gas emissions, and air pollution. Check the US EPA Green Vehicle Guide and NRCan's Fuel Consumption Guide to compare.

Ann Dale wrote:

I think we have to be careful about talking about the minority actions, and developing policies on that basis. I find that the two factors people use for avoiding change are safety and security, think of your IT people when you want to use open source, they evoke security. With respect to safety, the safe car has some very interesting design features, it has the safety specs of a mid-size Mercedes, regardless of its tippiness. With respect to road handling, it is also exceptionally stable. In Victoria, they are allowed to park for free, smart cars.

[I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

[/quote][/quote]

#158: Author: Tammy, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 4:59 pm

I think the transit system is slow to adjust because they do not charge enough to be profitable. Another case where the environmental value is not taken into account. In order to compete with cars bus fees have to be small (even though in Calgary it is now up to \$80/month for a bus pass), or else everyone would buy a car over taking the bus. That and they are usually city run so they have to be affordable to everyone. The problem is finding the balance. They need enough riders to provide enough buses, but they won't get the riders without enough buses. The chicken before the egg syndrome I suppose.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I am still completely amazed that there has not been major advancements in public transportation. The busses are so crowded in cities its uncomfortable, you have to wait, you try to be concious and you are late. there are no parking places but sometimes you still have to drive to get somewhere. It makes no sence to me why this need isnt being filled.

Ann Dale wrote:

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

#159: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:00 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Monica wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

On Ann's point, I don't believe it is so much a "love affair" with the car as a "shotgun marriage". Transit options are just not good enough except in the most major of cities. No one, and I mean no one, would rather stand on a bus for an hour when they can drive for fifteen minutes. That is our big problem, and until we provide reasonable alternatives, people will drive. I think once people see what a car free life can look like (Venice, one of my favourite cities, comes to mind) then they might be fighting for the chance to live that way.

I think this goes back to the point where alternatives do not seem to meet all our needs in certain societies.

I agree Lenore our love affair with cars is more like a shot gun marriage. We need cars and i'm all for cheeper more fuel efficient ones

I seem to be having a bit of a problem here, the post do not reconize my login Name

Sorry its Faron Knott, i get a message that the user name is already taken

#160: Author: kimwright, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:00 pm

I agree totally, people are creatures of habit and change of mind/behavior is very difficult.

I am sorry that I am just dropping in now. I just got home from work and want to catch up on the posts. I will be here tomorrow.

#161: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:00 pm

i just saw a commercial for tommorrows Canada Am, it will show a Canadian couple how to be more energy efficient--interesting, i'd like to watch it, but will be flying to work

#162: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:01 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

[/quote]

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largests cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.

#163: Author: Dawn, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:01 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree that diversity could play a large role, and could help get rid of some of the fear of the new. If people were given more choices they might be willing to experiment, knowign that no one was going to tear down all of the suburbs while they tried out a condo in the city. Diversity might be a key.

I think people like to know they have choices too. Instead of being told what to think they may like to

have options. The freedom of choice is also likely to encourage people to learn more about alternatives. This in itself could go a long way in phasing out fossil fuels.

#164: Author: b1jackson, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:01 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

Being a recent immigrant to the Island (5 years) I'm not sure exactly of the origins and the issues. I know when the Irvings tried to bring some turbines into the Malpeque area they ran them out of town. Opposition was huge mainly because of a private mega company running them and a great deal of mis-understanding. Currently the big wind farm is on the western tip but there are plans for one on the opposite end. This has faced some criticism for not building on the existing infrastructure. I think my boss (Minister of Environment) is a bit obsessive about it. Very passionate about wind.

#165: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:02 pm

Well, I am going to have to 'fess' up here and admit to owning a smart car. It is a joy to drive, and a brilliant design, you have absolutely no idea you are in a car that small, and you really feel good about driving it. As well, it will have a payback period much shorter than we anticipated, as our gas bill has been halved, saving I think about 2300 litres of gas a year. And you can fit a lot into the back of it, you just have to think differently. And because of unanticipated demand, they are introducing a four-door model next year.

[quote="jodi jane friesen"]I agree Monica, like the people that have a smart car to go to the store, the van to transport things or holidays and the mercedes to go out...really. It just isnt a convenient car for alot of households...and do you ever really fall in love with the smart car, except when you gloating about your park job.

Monica wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, Lenore will probably disagree with me here, but I think we need to fundamentally change the car as a transition strategy. Amory Lovins just published an on-line book entitled the Post Carbon End Game (available on our website under What's New) in which he argues we have to design ultra-light vehicles.

I do disagree, but one of the more interesting reasons for the people in this class has to do with complexity, something Lovin is infamous for ignoring. I rather like smart cars myself, but yesterday on-line an American friend of mine said "why in God's name would I buy a car three or four guys could pick up and walk away with?" I hadn't even thought of this aspect of ultralight cars. And then I read that in the UK, home of many young drunk men, this is becoming a problem- "Smart Car Tipping". Now this all seems sort of silly, but much of American marketing is based on fear- can you imagine the adds "Don't let your car walk away- buy a Hummer"

I have to say one thing I have always thought about the smart car, is how do you transport a family around in a smart car. If you consider that there are many households trying to get by with one vehicle, due to the rising costs of driving, the smart car just doesn't seem to be a

logical choice in such a situation.

#166: Author: Chyann Finnigan, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:03 pm

jalcockwhite wrote:

How many wind turbines are they operating? Do you know how much energy they are able to produce? And are there any local cooperatives that own shares in the turbines - like the Danish model. This seems to me to be a really good idea to gain public support.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

I'm not sure about Barry but this is a summary of a recent newspaper article that would answer both Lenore and Jain's questions (article: Wind farm gets top priority in S'side by Amber Shea in The Journal-Pioneer):

Summerside has proposed to erect a wind farm on an old landfill site in St. Eleanors, PEI. The provincial and federal governments have promised to contribute \$8.8 million through the Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund (MRIF) to the project as long as Summerside's proposal meets certain criteria (one being that an environmental assessment be conducted on the old landfill site).

Summerside wants to start out with a 5-megawatt windfarm producing 15% of the city's power, and if everything goes well, would like to eventually expand the farm so it will produce 12.5-megawatts of energy every hour the wind turbines are operating at maximum speed. According to an electrical engineer the site has proven to have good wind speeds based on the new provincial wind atlas and the tests that were performed on the area.

The system will cost about \$8 million and the city plans to use the gas tax money it will receive from the federal government as well as the MRIF dollars to help pay for the wind turbines. The city would like to have the first of two turbines up by March 31, 2007, as that is the deadline for people to receive the Wind Power Production Incentive (WPPI). WPPI is a federal incentive, which pays wind farmers about 1 cent for each kilowatt of energy they produce. The incentive would provide Summerside with about \$1.5 million over a 10-year period. The city is also talking about the possibility of using the energy in the garbage pockets of the landfill as biofuel.

The city currently buys its energy from New Brunswick Power to serve about 6,600 homes in Summerside. The city plans to continue to charge the same rate as the electric companies and put the money they make from the wind farms towards municipal services.

The city has indicated that this is the "tip of the iceberg" as far as opportunities the wind farm will present the city. As an example, the Tignish area is taking an initiative with hydrogen energy. The city could use the farm to power a hydrogen station in Summerside.

This article describes the power of incentives to initiate change.

#167: Author: Johnny, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:05 pm

Like the Danish model we read about, people don't want "Irving's" to own everything. Owning shares is a great way to go. I like the farmer's quote, "your own pigs don't stink."

bljackson wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

Being a recent immigrant to the Island (5 years) I'm not sure exactly of the origins and the issues. I know when the Irving's tried to bring some turbines into the Malpeque area they ran them out of town. Opposition was huge mainly because of a private mega company running them and a great deal of mis-understanding. Currently the big wind farm is on the western tip but there are plans for one on the opposite end. This has faced some criticism for not building on the existing infrastructure. I think my boss (Minister of Environment) is a bit obsessive about it. Very passionate about wind.

#168: Author: jalcockwhite, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:05 pm

Seen from the transportation company, they may not charge enough to be profitable but seen from the public's eye, it may be the opposite. I'm not sure what a monthly pass in Vancouver is, but your basic one zone fee is \$2.50. I think that is ridiculously expensive. After waiting around in the bus stop for a late bus, then having to stand up because the bus was full, missing the deadline to use my transfer - I ended up paying \$5 to go a relatively short distance. I wished I had had my car.

Tammy wrote:

I think the transit system is slow to adjust because they do not charge enough to be profitable. Another case where the environmental value is not taken into account. In order to compete with cars bus fees have to be small (even though in Calgary it is now up to \$80/month for a bus pass), or else everyone would buy a car over taking the bus. That and they are usually city run so they have to be affordable to everyone. The problem is finding the balance. They need enough riders to provide enough buses, but they won't get the riders without enough buses. The chicken before the egg syndrome I suppose.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I am still completely amazed that there has not been major advancements in public transportation. The busses are so crowded in cities its uncomfortable, you have to wait, you try to be concious and you are late. there are no parking places but sometimes you still have to drive to get somewhere. It makes no sence to me why this need isnt being filled.

Ann Dale wrote:

Shotgun marriages and hummers aside, what about if we simply tried to diversify our transportation infrastructure, instead of building big mega projects and/or trying to finance them. I think we often miss the many small steps that can lead to meaningful change looking for the big fix?

#169: Author: jlasuik, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:06 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

[/quote]

Not a question directed at me but I have an idea. How about a mass transit system that uses the highways. Complete with movie on board and a bar cart. Gas stations- allow the land to heal and let innovation take place.

#170: Author: Lenore Newman, ▫ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:07 pm

Smart cars definitely have cuteness on their side. I wouldn't mind one myself, if a car ever appears in the budget. I agree totally that transit systems can't charge enough to be competitive- after all, they have to compete with free roads. Until we subsidize each option evenly, there can't really be a "fair test" . However we can't just slap tolls on roads as it would be a real hardship given that the infrastructure has been designed to maximize driving. A difficult conundrum.

#171: Author: Ann Dale, ▫ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:08 pm

Does anyone know about the capacity of alternative energy sources to provide a stable energy base load for human activities? With respect to the management of used nuclear fuel, I encourage you to go to the e-Dialogue archives for our three dialogues in this area, our on-line forum and an interview between myself and the head of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO), Elizabeth Dowdeswell.

#172: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▫ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:08 pm

diversity, true. But people also want stability in a product and dependability. A hudge fear is that people will invest in a new technology and then its not produced anymore or the prices will go up. Isn't that the case with disel?

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree that diversity could play a large role, and could help get rid of some of the fear of the new. If people were given more choices they might be willing to experiment, knowign that no one was going to tear down all of the suburbs while they tried out a condo in the city. Diversity might be a key.

#173: Author: Meghan King, ▫ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:08 pm

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing ahuge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renevue

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.[/quote]

#174: Author: b1jackson, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:09 pm

From one government employee to another, I am going to tell you to visit our website.

Here is a link to part of it at least on the expansion component.
<http://www.gov.pe.ca/envengfor/index.php3?number=1012553&lang=E>

jalcockwhite wrote:

How many wind turbines are they operating? Do you know how much energy they are able to produce? And are there any local cooperatives that own shares in the turbines - like the Danish model. This seems to me to be a really good idea to gain public support.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

#175: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:09 pm

Thien Tran wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Sorry, about the previous post my finger slipped.

Anyhow, I think transit could use some help in the marketing area to make it "cool". The car industry has overwhelmed us with images associating nice vehicles with status. We see people with nice cars and assume they are "cool" and that they are well off. We see nice cars as extremely desirable and it will take a lot to deter people from the idea that this isn't necessarily true.

Perhaps if it became "cooler" to ride the bus you would see more kids opting for it than saving every last penny to buy a car. But Lenore is right too in saying that they need to improve the convience of the transit system dramatically if it is every to take its proper place in our society.

Hi guest,

Is that most high school kids call bus riders are "loser cruiser crowns"? Anyhow, I do agree with you if the transit services system improved by the looks, and more bus schedule on routes then may be more people will consider to take the bus to reduce their own driving times. I recall Montreal is having the best bus routes that the more residential rates/community then bus would run more especially during rush hours. And Metro was great way to go downtown to work or to universities. Other cities should consider faster systems (expressed train, bus ...) to take people then the situation will improve.

Ha, ha...."loser cruiser". I've heard buses and ALRT also called "nerd movers". I tried living without a car about 6 years ago and relying exclusively on public transportation and my bicycle and discovered there were even more drawbacks than just the inconvenience of getting to depots, infrequent pick-ups and inadequate routes. In this part of North America for sure, it isn't like Europe where people of all income classes take public transportation. Here in Vancouver there is a large element of "undesirables". It makes the ride quite unenjoyable. Additionally, I also found that in the confines of a bus, sicknesses spread rapidly (I have never been sick more often than when I took public transit). I prefer cycling. I think there should be more of a push to high-end bikes and commuting that way.

#176: Author: Tammy, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:09 pm

I could use the \$1200 if you want to send it to me Monica.

I do see your point though, and I felt the same way when I heard the news (even though I do need the money). Why not invest it in programs that will help everyone and better our community. The benefits of \$400 for each individual cannot and will not compare to what you could accomplish with the money on a whole. Mind you, I expect our economy will receive a nice surge, especially if people get the checks right before Christmas (good luck on that though).

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obstacles we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.[/quote]

#177: Author: suegirard, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:10 pm

But this is something that has happen in the Toronto area - I can't remember the 410 or something- how did they get people to pay for what is really a convenience. And in this case - it was for the convenience of driving for people who live way out..

Lenore Newman wrote:

Smart cars definitely have cuteness on their side. I wouldn't mind one myself, if a car ever appears in the budget. I agree totally that transit systems can't charge enough to be competitive- after all, they have to compete with free roads. Until we subsidize each option evenly, there can't really be a "fair test" . However we can't just slap tolls on roads as it would be a real hardship given that the infrastructure has been designed to maximize driving. A difficult conundrum.

#178: Author: ewaterman, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:10 pm

Johnny wrote:

Like the Danish model we read about, people don't want "Irving's" to own everything. Owning shares is a great way to go. I like the farmer's quote, "your own pigs don't stink."

b1jackson wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

Being a recent immigrant to the Island (5 years) I'm not sure exactly of the origins and the issues. I know when the Irving's tried to bring some turbines into the Malpeque area they ran them out of town. Opposition was huge mainly because of a private mega company running them and a great deal of mis-understanding. Currently the big wind farm is on the western tip but there are plans for one on the opposite end. This has faced some criticism for not building on the existing infrastruture. I think my boss (Minister of Environment) is a bit obsessive about it. Very passionate about wind.

hey johnny, i read about the danish wind turbines in the newspaper the other day and instead of one big company owning them the public owns them with shares invested in the turbines. they get dividends from their shares □ and clean energy. i think that sounds pretty good

#179: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:11 pm

Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing ahuge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renewue

I know Megan, we are completly missing the boat, and it's so dissapointing, and yes, I though the brochure was quite amusing, but depressing, and how much do you think the marketing cost us?

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.

[/quote]

#180: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:11 pm

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

 Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing ahuge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renevue

 Monica wrote:**Ann Dale wrote:**

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.

[/quote]

#181: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:12 pm

And Lenore, just so you know, it's me (Brian Grasser) who was the "Guest" who wrote the comment about promoting cycling for transportation. I seem to be having the same problem as Faron with the system not recognizing my login name.

#182: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:13 pm

If by stable you mean constantly available, rather than markets, I understand that some limits to wind power for example is that there is not always a constant supply to depend on, so there is a need for a supplement energy power or a great capacity to store energy.

Ann Dale wrote:

Does anyone know about the capacity of alternative energy sources to provide a stable energy base load for human activities? With respect to the management of used nuclear fuel, I encourage you to go to the e-Dialogue archives for our three dialogues in this area, our on-line forum and an interview between myself and the head of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO), Elizabeth Dowdeswell.

#183: Author: cpiedt, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:13 pm

Driving ones own car will always be more convenient than taking the bus. Money tends to be the driving factor for most of us and I honestly think that the cost of driving would have to be tripled than what it is now, and maybe even more than that in order to get people to start taking the bus.

#184: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:13 pm

Anne, you are right about that. I am sure you will not hear many complaining about the cheque and politicians (especially if an election is pending) want to give their constituents instant gratification.

Ann Dale wrote:

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing ahuge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renevue

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it's politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our province's future.

[/quote]

#185: Author: suegirard, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:14 pm

I heard that the price of diesel is up at the moment because they are switching the refining process - with only one/two refineries working at a time - this means shortage - leading to higher price. From what I understood the high prices are expected to continue with new refinery processes. But don't quote me on that one.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

diversity, true. But people also want stability in a product and dependability. A huge fear is that people will invest in a new technology and then it's not produced anymore or the prices will go up. Isn't that the case with diesel?

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree that diversity could play a large role, and could help get rid of some of the fear of the new. If people were given more choices they might be willing to experiment, knowing that no one was going to tear down all of the suburbs while they tried out a condo in the city. Diversity might be a key.

#186: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:14 pm

Good point Ann et al- this country has huge budget surpluses at the federal level- so why is all of our infrastructure held together with masking tape?
Are our politicians afraid to put money into long term projects?

#187: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:14 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

The surplus cheques seem like a political means of ensuring votes. Who is going to argue for change with a Premier that gives them money? Especially if you're a family of 4 looking at getting a sum of \$1,600?

#188: Author: Andrew Marshall, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:14 pm

jlasuik wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

Not a question directed at me but I have an idea. How about a mass transit system that uses the highways. Complete with movie on board and a bar cart. Gas stations- allow the land to heal and let innovation take place.[/quote]

Yeah I was thinking along those same lines Jason. There is always talk about twining the Port Mann Bridge and also building a new bridge that crosses the Fraser River between Langley and Maple Ridge. Again, thinking of the big fix, but is it really necessary? In building more bridges will only attract more cars on the road. They should instead build a transit system that runs on the current infrastructure and extends further into the Fraser Valley.

#189: Author: senglish, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:15 pm

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#190: Author: kimwright, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:15 pm

Appealing to the masses probably does work to get everyone to make the right choice, the x-mas lights, but it is still the essence of not getting people to stop and think about it but rather just sell the "green" product line. I agree that we don't have the data to really support all the "alternatives" or ~other, but just commercialism to keep the economy going round.

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree with both of these points. Industry will paint the change as expensive, and in some cases it will be, or at least will appear to be. Likely per hour the green lightbulbs work out about the same, but we tend to see "sticker shock"

It's funny you should mention "sticker shock". With the recent purchase of a house, I'm in the market to buy Christmas lights to make my house shine bright enough to put Clark Griswold to shame. Anyway, I'm at good old Canadian Tire looking for LED Icicle lights and they are completely sold out. Actually the LED lights seem to be flying off the shelves and the old standard lights are stocked full on the shelves. Is it now

the "fad" to buy LED lights? I know there has been a lot of hype surrounding these lights but maybe this is the way to go...Media, publicity, appealing to the materialistic sides of us?

#191: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:15 pm

I fear the ones putting the major demands on politicians around here have alot bigger pocketbook than Monica and I. Not to be pessimistic, but it seems that environemtal veiwpoints are still in the minority.

Ann Dale wrote:

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing a huge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renevue

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder it it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largests cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.

[/quote]

#192: Author: jalcockwhite, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:16 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Thien Tran wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Sorry, about the previous post my finger slipped.

Anyhow, I think transit could use some help in the marketing area to make it "cool". The car

industry has overwhelmed us with images associating nice vehicles with status. We see people with nice cars and assume they are "cool" and that they are well off. We see nice cars as extremely desirable and it will take a lot to deter people from the idea that this isn't necessarily true.

Perhaps if it became "cooler" to ride the bus you would see more kids opting for it than saving every last penny to buy a car. But Lenore is right too in saying that they need to improve the convenience of the transit system dramatically if it is every to take its proper place in our society.

Hi guest,

Is that most high school kids call bus riders are "loser cruiser crowns"? Anyhow, I do agree with you if the transit services system improved by the looks, and more bus schedule on routes then may be more people will consider to take the bus to reduce their own driving times. I recall Montreal is having the best bus routes that the more residential rates/community then bus would run more especially during rush hours. And Metro was great way to go downtown to work or to universities. Other cities should consider faster systems (expressed train, bus ...) to take people then the situation will improve.

Ha, ha...."loser cruiser". I've heard buses and ALRT also called "nerd movers". I tried living without a car about 6 years ago and relying exclusively on public transportation and my bicycle and discovered there were even more drawbacks than just the inconvenience of getting to depots, infrequent pick-ups and inadequate routes. In this part of North America for sure, it isn't like Europe where people of all income classes take public transportation. Here in Vancouver there is a large element of "undesirables". It makes the ride quite unenjoyable. Additionally, I also found that in the confines of a bus, sicknesses spread rapidly (I have never been sick more often than when I took public transit). I prefer cycling. I think there should be more of a push to high-end bikes and commuting that way.

What about covered bikeways? That would probably be a good incentive to get more people out riding to work - especially in rainy Vancouver. Admittedly, this would only work in cities, but that is likely the main environment for this type of transportation. Existing bike routes could be expanded and networked and then covered, sort of like a tunnel. Or perhaps some routes could be kept in the open and there could be covered alternatives???

#193: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:17 pm

Brian, you raise an interesting point, but we are all part of society and the 'undesirables' are also part of our community, for better or worse, however, that is not the subject of this dialogue. Yes, you are more cocooned in your car, but statistically, the odds of an accident are much greater in your vehicle than public transit, obesity levels may be correlated with car use, and more critically, you are affecting your children's future climate. So what to do? And as an older whatever, I am afraid to bike? Personal barriers, how to overcome? I would love to bike rather than working out in the gym, however, at my age, so difficult to learn and feel 'safe'.

[Ha, ha...."loser cruiser". I've heard buses and ALRT also called "nerd movers". I tried living without a car about 6 years ago and relying exclusively on public transportation and my bicycle and discovered there were even more drawbacks than just the inconvenience of getting to depots, infrequent pick-ups and inadequate routes. In this part of North America for sure, it isn't like Europe where people of all income classes take public transportation. Here in Vancouver there is a large element of "undesirables". It makes the ride quite unenjoyable. Additionally, I also found that in the confines of a bus, sicknesses spread rapidly (I have never been sick more often than when I took public transit). I

prefer cycling. I think there should be more of a push to high-end bikes and commuting that way.[/quote]

#194: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:17 pm

It seems the Conservative government in Alberta is unflappable! I just can't believe that the public does not want to see our surplus go to the development of sustainable infrastructure and would rather have \$400 dollars in there pocket. I can't believe that anyone feels that is a good use of the money?

#195: Author: ewaterman, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:18 pm

Andrew Marshall wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obstacles we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

Not a question directed at me but I have an idea. How about a mass transit system that uses the highways. Complete with movie on board and a bar cart. Gas stations- allow the land to heal and let innovation take place.

Yeah I was thinking along those same lines Jason. There is always talk about twining the Port Mann Bridge and also building a new bridge that crosses the Fraser River between Langley and Maple Ridge. Again, thinking of the big fix, but is it really necessary? In building more bridges will only attract more cars on the road. They should instead build a transit system that runs on the current infrastructure and extends further into the Fraser Valley.[/quote]

ya but what if those new bridges only allowed buses and say smart cars and scooters and no other non-efficient transport. then maybe alternative transportation would be more attractive

#196: Author: Guest, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:18 pm

b1jackson wrote:

From one government employee to another, I am going to tell you to visit our website.

Here is a link to part of it at least on the expansion component.
<http://www.gov.pe.ca/envengfor/index.php3?number=1012553&lang=E>

jacockwhite wrote:

How many wind turbines are they operating? Do you know how much energy they are able to produce? And are there any local cooperatives that own shares in the turbines - like the Danish model. This seems to me to be a really good idea to gain public support.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Barry, how did PEI manage to get support for moving ahead with wind? Do you think we could learn anything from their experience?

Newfoundland Hydro is currently looking into wind power also our company has just completed a tset and looking at the feaseability of wind as an additional power source.

#197: Author: suegirard, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:19 pm

I agree as well - there are some underlying political strcutures (I won't say games) that exist which have significant effects on the opportunities even for alternatives sources. A case in point would be the light bulbs. I don't the exact dates - but the invention of this particular energy efficient bulb has been around for awhile but had been stalled in the production process - and one can assume due to exisiting markets and political relationships. Hemp is another example in the US - where Dow Chemical has significant ties with the politicians. A shift to hemp from plastic would be significant to these organizations.

Johnny wrote:

Anne, you are right about that. I am sure you will not hear many complaining about the cheque and politicians (especially if an election is pending) want to give their consituents instant gratification.

Ann Dale wrote:

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing ahuge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renevue

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder it it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in

something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.

[/quote]

#198: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:20 pm

Not sure, but maybe it is because the problem is huge and they don't know where to start. If the Gov. were to invest in the environment, the military types say that they should have gotten the money, for example.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point Ann et al- this country has huge budget surpluses at the federal level- so why is all of our infrastructure held together with masking tape?
Are our politicians afraid to put money into long term projects?

#199: Author: Tammy, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:20 pm

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definitely helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#200: Author: Dawn, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:20 pm

I think alot of it has to do with the priorities of the voters. If the majority doesn't view sustainability as a key issue, it won't be one. Money always gets people's attention. That's why I think rebates can help win elections while real issues are overlooked.

Ann Dale wrote:

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing ahuge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renevue

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder it it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largests cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.

[/qu

#201: Author: Dawn, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:21 pm

I think alot of it has to do with the priorities of the voters. If the majority doesn't view sustainability as a key issue, it won't be one. Money always gets people's attention. That's why I think rebates can help win elections while real issues are overlooked.

Ann Dale wrote:

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I dont want it it isnt helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing ahuge opputunity to make a big impact with all of its oil renevue

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it's politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our province's future.

[/qu

#202: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:21 pm

One would think it would be a huge benefit for us to look into alternative energies because we could fund the project through our oil and gas revenues for now and in the future we would have the technology everyone else will be looking for.

Monica wrote:

It seems the Conservative government in Alberta is unflappable! I just can't believe that the public does not want to see our surplus go to the development of sustainable infrastructure and would rather have \$400 dollars in their pocket. I can't believe that anyone feels that is a good use of the money?

#203: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:22 pm

Certainly more public demands for policy change and the support for alternative energy is needed. But this lock-in also occurs because the industries and governments themselves are instrumental in resisting change to new technology because they have financial interests embedded in the current markets. Why would the government of Alberta want to promote change when they have some lucrative oil reserves to develop first.

Ann Dale wrote:

Monica and Meghan, you raise key points, why don't we plow back into the system to build more sustainably, what is the lock-in to the current system. Perhaps we need to build up more demands on our politicians?

Meghan King wrote:

Monica, I totally agree on the rebate thing. I don't want it if it isn't helping anything. And had you received your big glossy brochure on how we are spending the rest of our 6 bil\$ surplus. Nothing appears to be going towards protecting or cleaning up the areas that have made us so prosperous. I even heard today that the province has approved Encana to drill an additional 1200 gas wells in Suffield National Wildlife Preserve. I think Alberta is missing a huge opportunity to make a big impact with all of its oil revenue

Monica wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. One of the obstacles we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a

society, or a resource.

it seems that economics drive such decisions, but I have to question this in certain circumstances and wonder if it politics. Take Alberta for example.... huge budget surpluses from our energy revenues, but instead of investing the surplus in something to help us become more sustainable, such as a fast train between our largest cities (Edmonton and Calgary) that see tremendous commutes, every Albertan is given a \$400 cheque. I don't want or need the \$1,200 that my household will receive, I would much rather this money be spent on our provinces future.

[/quote]

#204: Author: b1jackson, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:22 pm

I heard that as well Sue. Just 2 days after buying a Jetta diesel. I doubled my miles per gallon compared to my compact SUV and all the particulate matter that comes out the tail pipe ends up over in Johnny's province when the wind is right :)

suegirard wrote:

I heard that the price of diesel is up at the moment because they are switching the refining process - with only one/two refineries working at a time - this means shortage - leading to higher price. From what I understood the high prices are expected to continue with new refinery processes. But don't quote me on that one.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

diversity, true. But people also want stability in a product and dependability. A huge fear is that people will invest in a new technology and then it's not produced anymore or the prices will go up. Isn't that the case with diesel?

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree that diversity could play a large role, and could help get rid of some of the fear of the new. If people were given more choices they might be willing to experiment, knowing that no one was going to tear down all of the suburbs while they tried out a condo in the city. Diversity might be a key.

#205: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:23 pm

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertans it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definitely helps you get re-elected.

senGLISH wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#206: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:23 pm

Andrew Marshall wrote:

jlasuik wrote:**Ann Dale wrote:**

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

Not a question directed at me but I have an idea. How about a mass transit system that uses the highways. Complete with movie on board and a bar cart. Gas stations- allow the land to heal and let innovation take place.

Yeah I was thinking along those same lines Jason. There is always talk about twining the Port Mann Bridge and also building a new bridge that crosses the Fraser River between Langley and Maple Ridge. Again, thinking of the big fix, but is it really necessary? In building more bridges will only attract more cars on the road. They should instead build a transit system that runs on the current infrastructure and extends further into the Fraser Valley.[/quote]

Andrew, that's exactly what we need here in the Lower Mainland; Sky Train to run out to Abbotsford (or maybe even Chilliwack). I had to drive from Burnaby to Langley the last 2 days and the #1 Highway is a total joke in both directions. And it's not just the main highways that are congested...it's EVERYWHERE. There are simply too many people in cars.

#207: Author: Monica, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:25 pm

I totally agree Megan, and although I know it is easy to think money talks, I just can't believe that people think that 1.4 billion dollars couldn't be better spent elsewhere. We all hear about the Fort McMurray being on the verge of collapse due to the influx in the population. We all have to see that our actions are unsustainable, and not planning for the future is tragic!

#208: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:25 pm

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the

internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

#209: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:25 pm

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

#210: Author: jalcockwhite, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:25 pm

I think Tammy's last sentence is a key piece of why governments aren't investing in long term projects and likely part of why things are held together with masking tape. Money is directed towards projects and people to keep the existing gov't in power, to make sure they get the votes. It is not necessarily a case of "do what is right", it is a case of "do what makes the money, whether it is for greater good or not". If people could see into the future and have clear evidence that our lives would be better without cars etc...then it wouldn't be so hard to invest in the environment (obviously).

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#211: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:26 pm

This opens a whole nasty can of political worms because Alberta already pays large portions of its oil revenues out through equalization payments etc. And after all that we still have a surplus, though we are the only province that still has to pay provincial health care premiums...So go figure. It a mess

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel

Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#212: Author: Johnny, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:26 pm

Maybe PEI's "wind generators" aren't generators at all. They are actually giant fans that blow all your pollution over to Nova Scotia - the tail pipe of North America. I'm watching you. I just installed a new speciation sampler to analyze what makes up our particulate, so I'll be looking for your stuff :)

b1jackson wrote:

I heard that as well Sue. Just 2 days after buying a Jetta diesel. I doubled my miles per gallon compared to my compact SUV and all the particulate matter that comes out the tail pipe ends up over in Johnny's province when the wind is right :)

suegirard wrote:

I heard that the price of diesel is up at the moment because they are switching the refining process - with only one/two refineries working at a time - this means shortage - leading to higher price. From what I understood the high prices are expected to continue with new refinery processes. But don't quote me on that one.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

diversity, true. But people also want stability in a product and dependability. A hudge fear is that people will invest in a new technology and then its not produced anymore or the prices will go up. Isn't that the case with disel?

Lenore Newman wrote:

I agree that diversity could play a large role, and could help get rid of some of the fear of the new. If people were given more choices they might be willing to experiment, knowign that no one was going to tear down all of the suburbs while they tried out a condo in the city. Diversity might be a key.

#213: Author: Adrian Paradis, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:26 pm

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#214: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:27 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

How about changing our car insurance system from a flat rate to one based on the number of kilometres driven between insurance renewals? BG

#215: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:28 pm

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#216: Author: kimwright, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:28 pm

That sounds really good. Centralizing and using existing infrastructure. I think that train transportation has opportunities. On a quote earlier someone was questioning politicians lack of money on long-term infrastructure projects. The train tracks are already in existence but the government does not maintain them - there have been a number of train wrecks in BC lately. For long distance travel I think that the train could be this luxurious with bar cart, entertainment, accomodations etc. But I don't think that anytime soon we will be able to convince the layman that he doesn't want the 7 passenger SUV with dvd, a/c, leather seats etc. and when they aren't inconvenienced by things such as schedules.

Andrew Marshall wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Andrew, can you think of any small steps to integrate more sustainable transportation choices into existing infrastructure?

[I think the problem with transportation is that by its nature investment is "big". A freeway can cost as much as \$500,000 a meter or more. Same with fast trains and subways. one of the obsticals we face is the "sunk cost effect"- we have paid so much for what we have we don't really want to abandon it. Unfortunately, this can destroy a society, or a resource.

Not a question directed at me but I have an idea. How about a mass transit system that uses the highways. Complete with movie on board and a bar cart. Gas stations- allow the land to heal and let innovation take place.

Yeah I was thinking along those same lines Jason. There is always talk about twining the Port Mann Bridge and also building a new bridge that crosses the Fraser River between Langley and Maple Ridge. Again, thinking of the big fix, but is it really necessary? In building more bridges will only attract more cars on the road. They should instead build a transit system that runs on the current infrastructure and extends further into the Fraser Valley.[/quote]

#217: Author: Monica, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:29 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

I think one thing that our government should step up on is subsidy of renewable energy source research and development. We have to have reasonable alternatives in order to make change. I think there should be mandate for a portion of oil company revenues to be used in not just the research but the development of alternatives to oil.

#218: Author: Dawn, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:29 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a good question. I don't know if letters work. Do you think they all get read? Or read by someone who can act on them? Maybe I'm pessimistic, but for some reason I don't think so. It would definitely take a huge unified effort to make a real change. Ultimately pressure from the majority influences political activity. The priorities of the majority just need to shift from monetary benefits to "total" benefits.

#219: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:29 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a tough one because I don't think they pay attention unless it's a sensational news item. Unless there is a large enough group to peak their interest and evoke pressure on their campaign, there doesn't seem to be too much hope for the little guy. Especially considering talk of SLAPP suits for people voicing their opinion publicly.

#220: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:30 pm

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque

definitely helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#221: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:30 pm

Perhaps there is such a diversity in what the public sees as the direction to turn at this point. A politician would really be going out on a limb if they were make a bold statement of direction, when even the public doesnt know where to go. Then there has also been such large changes in the Public services (jobs lost) and declining health care, some other main concerns of the public..that make it harder for politicians to pull out their guns on energy issues. Mind you the rising prices in energy for alberta is a big change that will hit hard.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point Ann et al- this country has huge budget surpluses at the federal level- so why is all of our infrastructure held together with masking tape?
Are our politicians afraid to put money into long term projects?

#222: Author: Tammy, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:32 pm

That is an interesting idea Brian, but as we learned in our economics class every solution brings another problem. I wonder if it is fair to charge individuals more that rely on their cars for their income. I guess I am thinking of people like pizza delivery guys or paper boys/girls. They probably have enough problems paying their bills as it is. But, I do think your idea would promote the right idea and at least account in a more accurate way the damage done by our vehicles. I guess I am just playing devils advocate here.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

How about changing our car insurance system from a flat rate to one based on the number of kilometres driven between insurance renewals? BG

#223: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:32 pm

Building codes could be an 'easy' place to start. Lets start building Canadian homes for Canada's dark and cold environment - energy efficient lighting and heat saving design.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

#224: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:32 pm

As one who does receive those letters. I.E. Save the Nahanni and such. It depends on how they are written. Mass mailling set up through Friends of the Whatever. No. A letter that is well written with a message gets more attention then a copied letter sent in a hundred times.

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a good question. I don't know if letters work. Do you think they all get read? Or read by someone who can act on them? Maybe I'm pessimistic, but for some reason I don't think so. It would definitely take a huge unified effort to make a real change. Ultimately pressure from the majority influences political activity. The priorities of the majority just need to shift from monetary benefits to "total" benefits.

#225: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:32 pm

Great idea about insurance. As for Ann's question- it comes down to lobbying. If you want to see how it is done, watch big tobacco and the American religious right. They seem to have it down pat.

#226: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:34 pm

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#227: Author: ewaterman, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:34 pm

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a good question. I don't know if letters work. Do you think they all get read? Or read by someone who can act on them? Maybe I'm pessimistic, but for some reason I don't think so. It would definitely take a huge unified effort to make a real change. Ultimately pressure from the majority influences political activity. The priorities of the majority just need to shift from monetary benefits to "total" benefits.

that is a really good question but no i don't think letters do the trick. i am also pesimistic and think that the government is too busy working for thier economic partners and buddies. i don't want this but we need a major colapse in the fossil fuel industry to have governments make new policys to change peoples behaviour. the colapse has to be stronger than "the war on bad guys" and recent hurricane disasters

#228: Author: jalcockwhite, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:34 pm

Subsidizing innovation, regardless of the source of innovation (i.e. big company or little company or individual) should be on top of the agenda.

Monica wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

I think one thing that our government should step up on is subsidy of renewable energy source research and development. We have to have reasonable alternatives in order to make change. I think there should be mandate for a portion of oil company revenues to be used in not just the research but the development of alternatives to oil.

#229: Author: cpiedt, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:35 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

I actually do think that letters work as a start, as long as they are in mass amounts and then don't stop there. Public protests work too by getting media attention which in turn gets more people involved and more pressure on government. I don't think very many politicians really care about what is right and wrong (okay, a few do) but they do know that pleasing the public gets them elected. For example, the drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was hugely protested and I honestly think that helped the way the issue was recently voted on by congress (not in favour of drilling...just yet)

#230: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:36 pm

Those hardships arise because of our false economy built on 'cheap' energy that is actually grossly underpriced. The governemnt has to stop sheltering us from reality and provide the tools to live in a high-priced energy environment. Those tools mean making less-energy demanding choices the affordable ones.

Tammy wrote:

That is an interesting idea Brian, but as we learned in our economics class every solution brings another problem. I wonder if it is fair to charge individuals more that rely on their cars for their income. I guess I am thinking of people like pizza delivery guys or paper boys/girls. They probably have enough problems paying their bills as it is. But, I do think your idea would promote the right idea and at least account in a more accurate way the damage done by our vehicles. I guess I am just playing devils advocate here.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

How about changing our car insurance system from a flat rate to one based on the number of kilometres driven between insurance renewals? BG

#231: Author: suegirard, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:36 pm

I think that you have to take a bottom up approach. I think that you are right Chyann - that it takes a large group with allot of pressure to make this kind of change happen - but who we represent at the local level, influences those we elect at the provincial level, influences those we elect at the federal level. OK - slightly naive for some contexts but considered the changes that have occurred for several provinces regarding legislation changes in these provinces. This comes about by voices of our representatives.

Chyann Finnigan wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a tough one because I don't think they pay attention unless it's a sensational news item. Unless there is a large enough group to peak their interest and envoke pressure on their campaign, there doesn't seem to be too much hope for the little guy. Especially considering talk of SLAPP suits for people voicing their opinion publicly.

#232: Author: Adrian Paradis, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:36 pm

Trading North/South vs. East/West is easier due to infrastucture. Not a lot of pipelines running east/west.

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#233: Author: Monica, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:36 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Great idea about insurance. As for Ann's question- it comes down to lobbying. If you want to see how it is done, watch big tobacco and the American religious right. They seem to have it down pat.

Very good point, and if the public was better educated as to the "true" costs of non-renewable resources including the environmental costs, I don't think it would be difficult to rally the lobbieists. I just don't think the general public is really aware of the impacts.

#234: Author: senglish, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:37 pm

From the sounds of things, that will be Alberta's problem? hmmm

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constitution says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

english wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#235: Author: jalcockwhite, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:38 pm

From my experience, public complaint letters often get sent to the wrong people. I get a lot of letters from people concerned about what is going on and how things are affecting the environment; however, I am not the person who has any say in the matter. All I do is file it and sometimes send a copy to my supervisor - who can't do anything either. Those who actually have the power to make change and act upon public concerns aren't really going to do so unless there is some major driving force (usually economic).

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a good question. I don't know if letters work. Do you think they all get read? Or read by someone who can act on them? Maybe I'm pessimistic, but for some reason I don't think so. It would definitely take a huge unified effort to make a real change. Ultimately pressure from the majority influences political activity. The priorities of the majority just need to shift from monetary benefits to "total" benefits.

#236: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:38 pm

Does anyone know how much energy supply Quebec supplies and Alberta to the total Canadian energy grid?

#237: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:39 pm

There has actually been a recent boom with lots of jobs. Spin off from the off-shore gas, I suppose (HaHa).

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was currious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause

devestation requiring national support.

#238: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:39 pm

I agree Johnny. Not saying i would love to have to pay more for things but seriously we need a reality check. Now that gas has come back down to a lower level i make the effort to pay the extra for the ethanol blended gas every now and then. By the way is ethanol blended that much better becasue it is an option that would require minimal changes to infrastrutre. It could be a good transition thing maybe.

Johnny wrote:

Those hardships arise because of our false economy built on 'cheap' energy that is actually grossly underpriced. The governeemt has to stop sheltering us from reality and provide the tools to live in a high-priced energy environment. Those tools mean making less-energy demanding choices the affordable ones.

Tammy wrote:

That is an interesting idea Brian, but as we learned in our economics class every solution brings another problem. I wonder if it is fair to charge individuals more that rely on their cars for their income. I guess I am thinking of people like pizza delivery guys or paper boys/girls. They probably have enough problems paying their bills as it is. But, I do think your idea would promote the right idea and at least account in a more accurate way the damage done by our vehicles. I guess I am just playing devils advocate here.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

How about changing our car insurance system from a flat rate to one based on the number of kilometres driven between insurance renewals? BG

#239: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:40 pm

I think shifting the subsidies from the fossil fuel industry to renewable energy technology is needed. I read a quote from http://www.nesea.org/publications/NESun/national_security.html that says the US government spends \$20 billion per year subsidizing coal and oil. Imagine that money in renewable technologies. Policies and directives of the World bank have to change. Canada could instill a carbon tax and shift the subsidies to renewables. Higher standards for emissions for all vehicles could be made. The public has to push for it too.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

#240: Author: b1jackson, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:41 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

How about changing our car insurance system from a flat rate to one based on the number of kilometres driven between insurance renewals?

BG

Thats a great one Brian. I remember the talented Team 1 discussing this in our last course. Very interesting concept but what about the people that drive for a living (ie) pizza boys, long haul truck companies etc. How to get the goods to the people without spending up a lot of cash on insurance?

#241: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:42 pm

What a terrible cost to our innovation and future?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I think shifting the subsidies from the fossil fuel industry to renewable energy technology is needed. I read a quote from http://www.nesea.org/publications_NESun/national_security.html that says the US government spends \$20 billion per year subsidizing coal and oil. Imagine that money in renewable technologies. Policies and directives of the World bank have to change. Canada could instill a carbon tax and shift the subsidies to renewables. Higher standards for emissions for all vehicles could be made. The public has to push for it too.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

#242: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:42 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

Timely question, Ann, about energy security and our U.S. neighbours. As I mentioned in our team discussion yesterday, the sale of the natural gas provider for BC (Terasen Gas) to a U.S. company (Kinder-Morgan) was approved yesterday. One of the reasons was "a committment to improve infrastructure and pipeline networks". I wonder if this means sending our natural gas south of the border and placing us in a competitve consumer market with U.S. citizens?

#243: Author: Monica, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:42 pm

I know this statement is likely very nieve, however, I do believe we all have the ability to send a message with a vote, and I believe we are going to be going to the poles fairly soon. Our poor voter turn out sends it's own message though doesn't it?

#244: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:42 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Does anyone know how much energy supply Quebec supplies and Alberta to the total Canadian energy grid?

Not much. But I don't know a true value.

Ann have you heard of some older proposals to dam central BC and ship the water and power south to California? I had an old college prof who talked about it. I just need to find my old notes.

From my memory there was a couple of proposals with varying methods, but the intent was to create a large central lake in one the valleys and ship the energy, water south to the growing California market. There have a been a couple over the years.

#245: Author: Guest, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:42 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

How about changing our car insurance system from a flat rate to one based on the number of kilometres driven between insurance renewals? BG

One guest to another this sounds great but may be a little unfair to those of us living in rural Canada and depend on driving to make a living FK

#246: Author: Johnny, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:43 pm

Ethanol blend fuel reminds me of the disposable/washable diaper debate. Do we sequester farm land for cotton, load it with pesticides, use oodles of energy and detergents to wash the stinky diapers; or do we dispose of one that lasts forever in a bundled clump in some plot of farmland sequestered for a landfill?

Point is, there is no best way to base a society on automobiles (and I do by the way, own a car and have a baby).

quote="Meghan King"]I agree Johnny. Not saying i would love to have to pay more for things but seriously we need a reality check. Now that gas has come back down to a lower level i make the effort to pay the extra for the ethanol blended gas every now and then. By the way is ethanol blended that much better becasue it is an option that would require minimal changes to infrastrutre. It could be a good transition thing maybe.

Johnny wrote:

Those hardships arise because of our false economy built on 'cheap' energy that is actually grossly underpriced. The government has to stop sheltering us from reality and provide the tools to live in a high-priced energy environment. Those tools mean making less-energy demanding choices the affordable ones.

Tammy wrote:

That is an interesting idea Brian, but as we learned in our economics class every solution brings another problem. I wonder if it is fair to charge individuals more that rely on their cars for their income. I guess I am thinking of people like pizza delivery guys or paper boys/girls. They probably have enough problems paying their bills as it is. But, I do think your idea would promote the right idea and at least account in a more accurate way the damage done by our vehicles. I guess I am just playing devils advocate here.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

How about changing our car insurance system from a flat rate to one based on the number of kilometres driven between insurance renewals? BG

[/quote]

#247: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:44 pm

Sorry, again, that was BG with the comment on the sale of Terasen Gas to the U.S. I'll have to keep tagging my posts.

#248: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:44 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I think shifting the subsidies from the fossil fuel industry to renewable energy technology is needed. I read a quote from http://www.nesea.org/publications_NESun/national_security.html that says the US government spends \$20 billion per year subsidizing coal and oil. Imagine that money in renewable technologies. Policies and directives of the World bank have to change. Canada could instill a carbon tax and shift the subsidies to renewables. Higher standards for emissions for all vehicles could be made. The public has to push for it too.

I guess that's the big problem. The public has to push for it and who in the public other than the people like us who are informed and care will push for change?

#249: Author: suegirard, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:44 pm

This exists for most provinces that have water resources that cross the border to the south. Most provinces have acts in place that requires a certain amount of water to cross the border no matter how much Canada may be drawing for hydro power. This is the case for the Columbia River - there are the issues of origin but also issues of intersecting (no the right word but I think that you get my

drift). There is that funny thing about ownership of nature that is creeping in here.

senglish wrote:

From the sounds of things, that will be Alberta's problem? hmmm

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#250: Author: ewaterman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:44 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I think shifting the subsidies from the fossil fuel industry to renewable energy technology is needed. I read a quote from http://www.nesea.org/publications_NESun/national_security.html that says the US government spends \$20 billion per year subsidizing coal and oil. Imagine that money in renewable technologies. Policies and directives of the World bank have to change. Canada could instill a carbon tax and shift the subsidies to renewables. Higher standards for emissions for all vehicles could be made. The public has to push for it too.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Let's change course slightly- governments have the power to "rule by fiat", ie make lock-in choices and override the market. For example, they chose AC over DC power, and American Fiat sets out the internet protocols that allow each web page to be unique. So given government can sometimes do this- what changes, either through law or subsidy, do you think government should impose at this point?

i agree with you jodi,

i think that it would look better if they put money into R&D and subsidies into the newer technologies instead of oil and gas. i really don't think this industry needs the subsidies reading about their over the top profits despite the decrease in oil reserves

#251: Author: Thien Tran, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:45 pm

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a good question. I don't know if letters work. Do you think they all get read? Or read by someone who can act on them? Maybe I'm pessimistic, but for some reason I don't think so. It would definitely take a huge unified effort to make a real change. Ultimately pressure from the majority influences political activity. The priorities of the majority just need to shift from monetary benefits to "total" benefits.

I don't think writing letters to the government would work because these letters are considered individual opinions even when they are signed by a group of people. I would think public protest demonstrations would draw more governmental attentions as their will be media involved then more people will get involved. The anti-G8 demonstration a few years ago. Unfortunately, violence usually goes along with the public demonstration when the situation gets out of hand and then the G8 super power will move their summit into a remote area to have their conference!!!

How can we win? Maybe a thread of "revolution" to overthrow current government out of power to gain their attention?

#252: Author: jalcockwhite, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:45 pm

Right Barry, that's why we didn't go with the tax on distance driven...it would not be a balanced approach for those who drive for a living. Other mechanisms would have to be built in to protect those people. The system may end up being very complex and unrealistic - not that it is a bad idea, just a difficult one.

b1jackson wrote:

#253: Author: Monica, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:45 pm

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Does anyone know how much energy supply Quebec supplies and Alberta to the total Canadian energy grid?

Not much. But I don't know a true value.

Ann have you heard of some older proposals to dam central BC and ship the water and power south to California? I had an old college prof who talked about it. I just need to find my old notes.

Now, it's been a few years since I worked for our energy utility here in alberta but at that time we were completely self sufficient. We were also sending 30% of our electricity south. On that note, talk about inefficiency in the market, the losses with transport are close to 30%

From my memory there was a couple of proposals with varying methods, but the intent was to create a large central lake in one the valleys and ship the energy, water south to the growing California market. There have a been a couple over the years.

#254: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:45 pm

Voting is very important at all levels of govt. I know voter apathy is an issue across Canada, but i think my recent municipal election had a 17% voter turn out. Make your voice heard at the local level as well as the provincial and federal. It may be the easiest way to see changes right in your own backyard.

Monica wrote:

I know this statement is likely very nieve, however, I do believe we all have the ability to send a message with a vote, and I believe we are going to be going to the poles fairly soon. Our poor voter turn out sends it's own message though doesn't it?

#255: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:46 pm

Monica wrote:

I know this statement is likely very nieve, however, I do believe we all have the ability to send a message with a vote, and I believe we are going to be going to the poles fairly soon. Our poor voter turn out sends it's own message though doesn't it?

Hey Monica, a poor voter turn out does sent a message: the message is that the public like the status quo and don't see a need for change. Unfortunate.

#256: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:47 pm

group activism usually gets the media attention that a little letter wouldnt. Organized associations with public infomration campains, group rallies, Public displays of politician bashing...these are the kinds of things that get attention, besides dispare and hitting the bottom of the bucket.

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

#257: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:47 pm

I would love to know why voter turnouts are so low. It just boggles the mind

#258: Author: Ann Dale, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:48 pm

I don't know about this particular proposal, but when I was in the Federal Government I had the privilege of negotiating in Washington with one of this country's foremost politicians. Coming out of our nth meeting, I turned to my esteemed colleague and asked why I thought we had just been in bed with an elephant, and he replied, kid, it is all about water, and this was in 1985.

Monica wrote:

Ann have you heard of some older proposals to dam central BC and ship the water and power south to California? I had an old college prof who talked about it. I just need to find my old notes.

Now, it's been a few years since I worked for our energy utility here in alberta but at that time we were completely self sufficient. We were also sending 30% of our electricity south. On that note, talk about inefficiency in the market, the losses with transport are close to 30%

From my memory there was a couple of proposals with varying methods, but the intent was to create a large central lake in one the valleys and ship the energy, water south to the growing California market. There have a been a couple over the years.

#259: Author: b1jackson, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:48 pm

I've been there before many times as well Jain. Being the government employee to vent at and when it comes to them challenging the legislation that I am enforcing I always say, talk to the person that comes to your door every 4 years and shakes your hand. They are the ones that make the rules. Then they hang up on me.

jalcockwhite wrote:

From my experience, public complaint letters often get sent to the wrong people. I get a lot of letters from people concerned about what is going on and how things are affecting the environment; however, I am not the person who has any say in the matter. All I do is file it and sometimes send a copy to my supervisor - who can't do anything either. Those who actually have the power to make change and act upon public concerns aren't really going to do so unless there is some major driving force (usually economic).

Dawn wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

That's a good question. I don't know if letters work. Do you think they all get read? Or read by someone who can act on them? Maybe I'm pessimistic, but for some reason I don't think so. It would definitely take a huge unified effort to make a real change. Ultimately pressure from the majority influences political activity. The priorities of the majority just need to shift from monetary benefits to "total" benefits.

#260: Author: Johnny, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:49 pm

Off-shore natural gas is found off Sable Island, and the gas pipeline runs behind my house. However, it is not economically feasible for our very dirty, coal-burning power plants to fire up their one natural gas generator; so it is all sold to the U.S. I also want to tap into the gas for my house, but that would cost a great portion of what my house is worth.

Anonymous wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a

cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was currious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devestation requiring national support.

Timely question, Ann, about energy security and our U.S. neighbours. As I mentioned in our team discussion yesterday, the sale of the natural gas provider for BC (Terasen Gas) to a U.S. company (Kinder-Morgan) was approved yesterday. One of the reasons was "a committment to improve infrastructure and pipeline networks". I wonder if this means sending our natural gas south of the border and placing us in a competitve consumer market with U.S. citizens?

#261: Author: Monica, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:49 pm

Meghan King wrote:

Voting is very important at all levels of govt. I know voter apathy is an issue across Canada, but i think my recent municipal election had a 17% voter turn out. Make your voice heard at the local level as well as the provincial and federal. It may be the easiest way to see changes right in your own backyard.

Monica wrote:

I know this statement is likely very nieve, however, I do believe we all have the ability to send a message with a vote, and I believe we are going to be going to the poles fairly soon. Our poor voter turn out sends it's own message though doesn't it?

And what kind of message does that send our politicians about the public involvement in public policies and issues? No wonder there is so little thought, and seemingly lack of responsibility put into the policies the government supports.

#262: Author: Johnny, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:50 pm

SLAPP

jodi jane friesen wrote:

group activism usually gets the media attention that a little letter wouldnt. Organized associations with public infomration campains, group rallies, Public displays of politician bashing...these are the kinds of things that get attention, besides dispare and hitting the bottom of the bucket.

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

#263: Author: kimwright, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:51 pm

Is this type of trading not crossing political boundaries, lines on a map that define rights? but this could mean less for transportation costs etc. This is what we are all talking about. Developing geographical communities. Too bad, sorry that this is a little naive.

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Trading North/South vs. East/West is easier due to infrastructure. Not a lot of pipelines running east/west.

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constitution says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

#264: Author: Guest, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:52 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Sorry, again, that was BG with the comment on the sale of Terasen Gas to the U.S. I'll have to keep tagging my posts.

Hey Brian, seems we have the same ID again
Faron

#265: Author: Dawn, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:52 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

I would love to know why voter turnouts are so low. It just boggles the mind

I think alot of people don't agree with any of the political parties, or what they stand for. Or they just don't believe any of it any more. They figure that they don't believe in any of the available choices and therefore the choice is not worth making.

#266: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:53 pm

Well, this has been a very intense dialogue. We have set a new per hour record for posts, I think. Let's start wrapping it up with closing thoughts- my slow-food pasta meal is almost ready- I have been nursing it along between posts.

#267: Author: Meghan King, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:54 pm

It seems at higher levels that representatives simply vote along party lines so it is discouraging and people feel that they cant have an influence

Dawn wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

I would love to know why voter turnouts are so low. It just boggles the mind

I think alot of people don't agree with any of the political parties, or what they stand for. Or they just don't believe any of it any more. They figure that they don't believe in any of the available choices and therefore the choice is not worth making.

#268: Author: jodi jane friesen, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:54 pm

I think that Canada is afraid to deny Americans access to our resources, afraid it will effect our national security. Canada also hasnt developed the secondary insustries as has the united states...so we just end up bying the final products back from them. Good business from the american side.

Anonymous wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was curious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devastation requiring national support.

Timely question, Ann, about energy security and our U.S. neighbours. As I mentioned in our team discussion yesterday, the sale of the natural gas provider for BC (Terasen Gas) to a U.S. company (Kinder-Morgan) was approved yesterday. One of the reasons was "a committment to improve infrastructure and pipeline networks". I wonder if this means sending our natural gas south of the border and placing us in a competitive consumer market with U.S. citizens?

#269: Author: jalcockwhite, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:55 pm

I think this goes two ways - either the public is satisfied with status quo or they are so disillusioned that they are convinced that no gov't will ever do any good so what's the point.

Monica wrote:

Meghan King wrote:

Voting is very important at all levels of govt. I know voter apathy is an issue across Canada, but i think my recent municipal election had a 17% voter turn out. Make your voice heard at the local level as well as the provincial and federal. It may be the easiest way to see changes right in your own backyard.

Monica wrote:

I know this statement is likely very nieve, however, I do believe we all have the ability to send a message with a vote, and I believe we are going to be going to the poles fairly soon. Our poor voter turn out sends it's own message though doesn't it?

And what kind of message does that send our politicians about the public involvement in public policies and issues? No wonder there is so little thought, and seemingly lack of responsibility put into the policies the government supports.

#270: Author: cpiedt, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:55 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, this has been a very intense dialogue. We have set a new per hour record for posts, I think. Let's start wrapping it up with closing thoughts- my slow-food pasta meal is almost ready- I have been nursing it along between posts.

Great discussion - see everyone tomorrow night

#271: Author: Monica, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:55 pm

Johnny wrote:

Off-shore natural gas is found off Sable Island, and the gas pipeline runs behind my house. However, it is not economically feasible for our very dirty, coal-burning power plants to fire up their one natural gas generator; so it is all sold to the U.S. I also want to tap into the gas for my house, but that would cost a great portion of what my house is worth.

Anonymous wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

What about our energy futures, particularly with our neighbour down below? Do you know it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west? What happens when they need our energy? What happens to our energy security, will we ever deny anyone access, is it right to say you 'own' that resource at the expense of your neighbours, your closest ones?

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Johnny.. that is an East Coast thing. I really do need to make it out to see that side of the country. Just need more jobs out your way.

Johnny wrote:

You mean all of Newfoundland's hydro is Quebec's :)

Adrian Paradis wrote:

The Constition says it is Alberta's. Just like all hydro is Quebec of Ontario. I don't think AB is against giving its fair share.

Johnny wrote:

Hi Tammy

I don't think it is so much a hand out; more like a thinking that we are all in this together. Alberta oil, according to this group in earlier posts, is Canada oil.

Tammy wrote:

I can tell you why it isn't going to the National debt. It is because according to Albertan's it is our money and we deserve the benefits. But, I bet if the shoe were on the other foot we would be wanting a hand out too.

The government has invested a lot of money in other funds. It is just that the surplus is so huge I think they feel Albertans want a piece for themselves and of course a cheque definately helps you get re-elected.

senglish wrote:

I was currious why they don't apply that surplus against the national debt, moving the whole country towards sustainability ... that or a reserve fund for the next time mad cow, or drought, or rain cause devestation requiring national support.

Timely question, Ann, about energy security and our U.S. neighbours. As I mentioned in our team discussion yesterday, the sale of the natural gas provider for BC (Terasen Gas) to a U.S. company (Kinder-Morgan) was approved yesterday. One of the reasons was "a committment to improve infrastructure and pipeline networks". I wonder if this means sending our natural gas south of the border and placing us in a competitve consumer market with U.S. citizens?

This is an interesting point regarding the costly switch to natural gas instead of coal. Inland Cement in Edmonton recently switched their kiln fuel from natural gas to coal, since the cost of natural gas was continually rising. They had a 6 inch line natural gas line coming into the plant, but Alberta Environment approved the project to switch to coal even with all the public concern over the burning of coal. It doesn't make much sense environmentally, however, economically it was a no brainer.

#272: Author: Tammy, □Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:55 pm

I think voting turnout is so low because it is inconvenient and because people feel detached from the

political system. I wonder if voting could somehow be done securely on-line would more people vote? I have a feeling they would. But there is also a lot of sceptism over politics. I don't know if people feel it actually makes a difference if they vote or not.

I remember there was a Simpson episode where they put a curfew in place for people under 60 and it was because all of the old people voted. The vote was won by one and I think the episode ends with Marge saying "we should have voted" and Homer saying "one vote doesn't make a difference". I love Simpsons.

#273: Author: Adrian Paradis, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:56 pm

Thanks...talk to everyone tomorrow night. AP

#274: Author: ewaterman, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:56 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, this has been a very intense dialogue. We have set a new per hour record for posts, I think. Let's start wrapping it up with closing thoughts- my slow-food pasta meal is almost ready- I have been nursing it along between posts.

i've enjoyed this discussion even though it was a bit fast for me to keep up at times. everybody has a lot of great ideas but i feel when it comes down to it, unfortunately they are just ideas and really how do we change things. i guess holding on to our values and working towards what we beleive in. (i know it sounds fluffy, but it really is true)

#275: Author: Ann Dale, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:56 pm

Thank you, one and all, lovely discussion, wish I had a dinner waiting, am away from my family and my beloved dogs, talk to you tomorrow.

#276: Author: jodi jane friesen, □ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:57 pm

owch... your right better keep your mouth shut

Johnny wrote:

SLAPP

jodi jane friesen wrote:

group activism usually gets the media attention that a little letter wouldnt. Organized associations with public infomration campains, group rallies, Public displays of politician bashing...these are the kinds of things that get attention, besides dispare and hitting the bottom of the bucket.

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

#277: Author: Chyann Finnigan, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:57 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, this has been a very intense dialogue. We have set a new per hour record for posts, I think. Let's start wrapping it up with closing thoughts- my slow-food pasta meal is almost ready- I have been nursing it along between posts.

Have a great night everyone. Quite a great discussion!

#278: Author: Guest, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:57 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

I would love to know why voter turnouts are so low. It just boggles the mind

There doesn't seem to be burning issues anymore other than the sponsorship scandal, and if an election is called around christmas time i feel voter turnout will be even lower sorry to say FK

#279: Author: Dawn, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:57 pm

My closing thought...I think in discussions of any aspect of sustainability it becomes apparent that real change can not be accomplished with a complete revamping of current priorities and incentives. Full cost accounting needs to become a priority in all undertakings, and we all have to re-evaluate what we "need" to be happy.

Until tomorrow...

#280: Author: Tammy, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:58 pm

Thanks and good night!

#281: Author: Lenore Newman, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:58 pm

Have a great night everyone- until tomorrow.

#282: Author: suegirard, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 5:59 pm

Have a good night - and I agree Erin - discussion helps us to understand the variability of actions - but can't always resolve the issues.

#283: Author: kimwright, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 6:00 pm

Agreed jodi, power in numbers. Should government impose, right now the voting rate in bc is low this past election because there are limited options even if there are alternative candidates their success rate is not very high. I don't really want the government to have the power to impose when it is not truly representative.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

group activism usually gets the media attention that a little letter wouldnt. Organized associations with public information campaigns, group rallies, Public displays of politician bashing...these are the kinds of things that get attention, besides dispare and hitting the bottom of the bucket.

Ann Dale wrote:

How do we increase public demand on our politicians? Do letters work? Do you think they listen to stuff like we are doing?

#284: Author: Monica, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 6:00 pm

I agree fully with Dawns comment on full cost accounting being a necessity of change in regards to energy choices.

I too have dinner waiting, and my daughter has been asking for the last 10 minutes if I'm done talking on the computer yet.

Good night everyone. I'll talk to you tomorrow. I really enjoyed the discussing tonight!!

#285: Author: kimwright, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 6:05 pm

I guess everyone is signing off - I lukily have dinner waiting tonight - I bought a new crock pot - what is that for energy? it is on all day. But it will taste so good.

I will definately make it on time for the next disucssion. Talking about inconveniend bus schedules - I got a call from Amy. Amy was working on a train derailment away from home and the home flight didn't land in cancelgar so she was on a bus this evening somewhere between kelowna and nelson and not able to make it this evening.

#286: Author: kimwright, ▢Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 6:15 pm

Meghan, it does seem to be increased and it is hard to convince people that also benefitting from this by work and the paycheque that they receive. Oil is not my local employment opportunity but trades are in high demand in the oil fields and providing work opportunities for people around me. It is this paycheque that they bring back though. And albertans, if wise are applying their gas cheque to their msp premiums your right it is a mess.

Meghan King wrote:

Definitely, we were talking in our group discussion also about how, at least in the West, it seems that oil reserves are increasing not becoming scarce. It becomes very hard to convince people that change is needed when they cannot physically see a shortage or direct evidence of environmental damage.

#287: Author: kimwright, ▢ Posted: Thu Nov 17, 2005 6:15 pm

Meghan, it does seem to be increased and it is hard to convince people that also benefitting from this by work and the paycheque that they receive. Oil is not my local employment opportunity but trades are in high demand in the oil fields and providing work opportunities for people around me. It is this paycheque that they bring back though. And albertans, if wise are applying their gas cheque to their msp premiums your right it is a mess.

Meghan King wrote:

Definitely, we were talking in our group discussion also about how, at least in the West, it seems that oil reserves are increasing not becoming scarce. It becomes very hard to convince people that change is needed when they cannot physically see a shortage or direct evidence of environmental damage.

Page 1 of 1

printer-friendly to pic mod

Powered by phpBB 2.0.11 ©