

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

Royal Roads -> ES322 - #3 - Political change for sustainable energy futures -> Energy Security Action Plan

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

#1: Energy Security Action Plan Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 9:54 am

Welcome from an overcast Victoria, don't let anyone tell you it isn't dark here in the winter. What I would like to talk about today is an energy security action plan for Canada. Let's imagine we are senior privy council officers directed to draft such a plan for Cabinet, that is both doable and feasible and will be accepted by the majority of the Canadian public.

The structure of our plan will be a list of overarching principles for energy security, followed by a detailed action plan to achieve those principles.

Let's structure our discussion this way, first half hour on the principles, next half hour on the micro incentives and policies to achieve those principles and then the next half hour on macro indicators and incentives. Don't forget our discussions yesterday and the day before about technological lock-in, individual psychology and so forth. On to principles.

#2: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:01 am

A commitment to research and development of alternative energy sources would ensure that Canada is not solely dependent on its non renewable resources

#3: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:02 am

Canada's energy security principles should include the ability provide reliable and affordable sources of energy to citizens and it would have to be socially, economically and environmentally sustainable or beneficial.

#4: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:03 am

The principles of energy security include diversity of supply, economic efficiency, renewable energy flows, research and development, and preparedness.

#5: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:03 am

Maintaining a supply of energy to the country but still benefiting from the export of energy.

#6: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:03 am

A secure energy initiative would have to rely on more domestic produced sources, to buffer the effects of international issues ...

#7: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:04 am

Megan, this needs to be more along the lines of a principle, Canada is committed to diversifying its energy supply to decrease its reliance on non renewable resources.

Meghan King wrote:

A commitment to research and development of alternative energy sources would ensure that Canada is not solely dependent on its non renewable resources

#8: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:04 am

It should be recognised that government must play a leadership role in the movement towards a sustainable energy future.
(kinda obvious I know)

#9: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:04 am

Canadians need to feel secure that we will have energy sources well into the future, that we won't use it all up or ship it away. I think there is concern that alternatives may not be as secure.

#10: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:04 am

Excellent principle.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Canada's energy security principles should include the ability provide reliable and affordable sources of energy to citizens and it would have to be socially, economically and environmentally sustainable or beneficial.

#11: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:05 am

Anonymous wrote:

A secure energy initiative would have to rely on more domestic produced sources, to buffer the effects of international issues ...

Speaking of "domestic", this may not be what you meant by domesticated, and may be a bit off topic, but did you see you can buy small 400W wind turbines at Canadian Tire now?

#12: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:05 am

I think one problem with providing security for energy in Canada is how the current system is intertwined with the american system.

#13: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:06 am

The obvious has to be stated sometimes, but frame this in a more active voice. The Federal Government of Canada is committed to playing a leadership role in the movement towards a sustainable energy future. In the action plan, think about the 'how'. As well, we haven't defined what sustainable energy is, a reliable, secure . . .

Daryl Lawes wrote:

It should be recognised that government must play a leadership role in the movement towards a sustainable energy future.
(kinda obvious I know)

#14: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:07 am

Critical point, how do you turn this into a principle?

Kevin Bill wrote:

I think one problem with providing security for energy in Canada is how the current system is intertwined with the american system.

#15: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:08 am

suegirard wrote:

Maintaining a supply of energy to the country but still benefiting from the export of energy.

I agree that maintenance of a countries energy supply is critical to energy security, but Sue raises an interesting point about the benefits fro exportation of energy. This becomes a balancing act, and I think that our own supply sometimes suffer from the profits of exporation.

I believe we must also implement regulatory actions to ensure adequate supply margin which will continue into the future and prevent future price spikes.

#16: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:08 am

Kevin Bill wrote:

I think one problem with providing security for energy in Canada is how the current system is intertwined with the american system.

Kein... As you mention and Guest (Brian?) mentioned that the policy shoud focus on domestic supply first. This would allow Canada to export its energy and not rely on foreign sources.

#17: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:08 am

Is it one future or many possible energy futures?

#18: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:09 am

suegirard wrote:

Maintaining a supply of energy to the country but still benefiting from the export of energy.

To expand on this principle, Canada should set policy to ensure that domestic needs are given priority over foreign interests, despite instruments like NAFTA and WTO where economic, legal and political agendas exist and the potential exists for Canada to enter into commitments which may profit some, but not meet the needs of Canadians overall. (Brian)

#19: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:09 am

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

#20: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:09 am

The government will continue to support and assist financial into the research and development of alternative energy sources

#21: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:09 am

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

#22: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:09 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Critical point, how do you turn this into a principle?

Kevin Bill wrote:

I think one problem with providing security for energy in Canada is how the current system is intertwined with the american system.

Since Canada is a net exporter of energy (hydro, oil and gas etc) maybe the government should use the surplus from these areas to invest in sustainable energy sources like wind/solar etc.

#23: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:10 am

I suppose as a principle we would want to make a commitment to maintaining the Canadian energy supply and an independent and self-sufficient industry so that it is not prone to major influence from foreign nations.

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Kevin Bill wrote:

I think one problem with providing security for energy in Canada is how the current system is intertwined with the American system.

Kevin... As you mention and Guest (Brian?) mentioned that the policy should focus on domestic supply first. This would allow Canada to export its energy and not rely on foreign sources.

#24: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:10 am

Canada must continue to create legislature that protects and provides incentives to reducing greenhouse gas emissions

#25: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:11 am

Kevin Bill wrote:

I think one problem with providing security for energy in Canada is how the current system is intertwined with the American system.

It is, but

For Canada energy policies to be successful in the long term, they should not be in direct conflict with the those of the international community.

#26: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:11 am

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Canada's energy security principles should include the ability provide reliable and affordable sources of energy to citizens and it would have to be socially, economically and environmentally sustainable or beneficial.

I think that this is a good mission statement for the principles. We could then maybe add what goals each principle should entail eg:

Environmentally sustainable: The energy provided should be moving toward sources that are cleaner, and have long term possibilities. Metrics to be used include: GHG measures per gig, expected life span of infrastructure and raw materials, environmental impacts during initial setup as well as during operating life.

Maybe this is too specific?

#27: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:11 am

I think we face many energy futures. A shift away from fossil fuels will likely lead to the emergence of a diverse and varied supply. This will help to ensure adequate reliable supplies, competitive markets, and widespread economic benefits instead of of the majority of benefits being concentrated in a specific area.

#28: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:11 am

Now, we are getting at the nub. Canadians are entitled to a reliable, secure source of energy. I believe however that rights must be balanced with responsibilities, equally we are responsible for conserving non-renewables?

Anonymous wrote:

suegirard wrote:

Maintaining a supply of energy to the country but still benefiting from the export of energy.

To expand on this principle, Canada should set policy to ensure that domestic needs are given priority over foreign interests, despite instruments like NAFTA and WTO where economic, legal and political agendas exist and the potential exists for Canada to enter into commitments which may profit some, but not meet the needs of Canadians overall. (Brian)

#29: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:12 am

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

What about government assistance to the portion of the population that can't economically afford a sustainable form of energy?

#30: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:12 am

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

#31: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:13 am

The specifics are brilliant for the action plan, which often don't include measurements, keep this in mind for the next half hour.

shawn samborsky wrote:

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Canada's energy security principles should include the ability provide reliable and affordable sources of energy to citizens and it would have to be socially, economically and environmentally sustainable or beneficial.

I think that this is a good mission statement for the principles. We could then maybe add what goals each principle should entail eg:

Environmentally sustainable: The energy provided should be moving toward sources that are cleaner, and have long term possibilities. Metrics to be used include: GHG measures per gig, expected life span of infrastructure and raw materials, environmental impacts during initial setup as well as during operating life.

Maybe this is too specific?

#32: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:13 am

Kevin Bill wrote:

I think one problem with providing security for energy in Canada is how the current system is intertwined with the american system.

Maybe there could be a positive direction for renewable resources since we are already so intertwined with the States, that there be a policy of sharing the technology between countries.

#33: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:14 am

Again, a key point, don't forget that it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west, so how would this be a principle?

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

#34: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:15 am

Good point Dawn - the waste and byproducts of renewable energies also need to be considered. I think that sometimes we just think that because it is not oil it is better but the materials including batteries used in solar power are not environmentalall friendly.

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

#35: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:15 am

Equity principle?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

What about government assistance to the portion of the population that can't economically afford a sustainable form of energy?

#36: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:15 am

That's definitely important too. Equality among people, and the availability of basic necessities for is a definite requirement to truly have a sustainable society. Unfortunately with the costs that will be associated with this transformation it is unlikely that initial funding will be devoted toward this avenue. But maybe a more diversified industry will help to create jobs and make energy more affordable.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

What about government assistance to the portion of the population that can't economically afford a sustainable form of energy?

#37: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:15 am

Good point Dawn we must improve inter-provincial trading some how, and I know geography has a lot to do with this. The US is a lot closer to each province than we are to each other

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

#38: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:16 am

Government will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

#39: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:16 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Again, a key point, don't forget that it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west, so how would this be a principle?

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

Improving relations with the US, in areas of technology development, trade, supply and demand

#40: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:16 am

Things are always changing, I think we will have more than one energy future. What seems like a great idea now may not in 10 years.

Energies are more sustainable and feasible in different regions than others and since Canada is so big we can't expect what works in one area to work in another.

#41: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:17 am

Canada's energy security should focus on the potential to develop renewable energy sources as alternatives or supplement to the fossil fuel industry in order to reduce GHG emmission, promote technological advance and economic prosperity and to forsee and be prepared for fossil fuel shortages in the future

Ann Dale wrote:

Is it one future or many possible energy futures?

#42: Author: senglish,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:17 am

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing inovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go allong way to secureing sustainability.

#43: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:17 am

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

I remember being at a meeting at the Ministry of environment in BC and one person explained how BC Hydro was making such a profit. Since Hydroelectric stations can be turned on and off fairly easily (just release some more water from the reservoir), they would shut them down at night, and purchase power from Alberta really cheap (like 1c perKw), who had to keep their coal/gas plants running, and then during the day they would ramp up production and sell it to California for 100 times that amount.

#44: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:18 am

The principle from this could be The Federal Government is committed to working with the provinces to produce an energy security bill that is designed to facilitate the flow of energy between provinces and the diversification of energy sources within provinces.

Faron Knott wrote:

Good point Dawn we must improve inter-provincial trading some how, and I know geography has a lot to do with this. The US is a lot closer to each province than we are to each other

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

#45: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:18 am

Good Point Amy

We need some assurance from governments that they will not start privatizing these industries when the political climate changes or when a company loses money.

#46: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:19 am

kristawatts wrote:

Gouvernement will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

i like this one, could they offer finacial incentives to companies that develop/produce in a "green" manner. Grants/subsidies?

#47: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:19 am

I wonder if they would have adopted the same policies if the coal plants were located a little closer to them.

Kevin Bill wrote:

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable committements of trade.

I remember being at a meeting at the Ministry of environment in BC and one person explained how BC Hydro was making such a profit. Since Hydroelectric stations can be turned on and off fairly easily (just release some more water from the reservoir), they would shut them down at night, and purchase power from Alberta really cheap (like 1c perKw), who had to keep their coal/gas plants running, and then during the day they would ramp up production and sell it to California for 100 times that amount.

#48: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:19 am

Action plan material.

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing inovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go allong way to securing sustainability.

#49: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:20 am

I agree that the idea of many possible futures is important because we are in a transistion period and we are not sure what the best possible solutions are. So we need to foster innovations in all areas of society, environment and economis in an attempt to find the best balance. As was mentioned everything is constantly changing so we cannot expect to find an answer and stick with that for the next 50 years. We need to develop a framework that fosters change and development on a continual basis.

Amy Wilson wrote:

Things are always changing, I think we will have more than one energy future. What seems like a great idea now may not in 10 years.

Energies are more sustainable and feasible in different regions than others and since Canada is so big we can't expect what works in one area to work in another.

#50: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:20 am

I wonder why it is easier to trade north/south than east/west? Canada should remain independent from agreements with the United States and should concentrate on the principle within its own boundaries. As a viable sector renewable energy could be exported to the US.

Ann Dale wrote:

Again, a key point, don't forget that it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west, so how would this be a principle?

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

#51: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:21 am

Dawn wrote:

That's definitely important too. Equality among people, and the availability of basic nessecities for is a definite requirement to truly have a sustainable society. Unfortunately with the costs that will be associated with this transformation it is unlikely that intial funding will be devoted toward this avenue. But maybe a more diversified industry will help to create jobs and make energy more affordable.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

What about government assistance to the portion of the population that can't economically afford a sustainable form of energy?

True, but i was thinking of the population of people that can barely afford current energy bills, so how would they afford new more expensive forms of energy? Maybe if the government subsidized them in some form, there perception or attitude towards a changing technology would be altered.

#52: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:21 am

Two points. Re: the interprovincial trading, it's good for a secure supply to have agreements in place within the country, but the difficulty is that there are greater economic benefits from exporting to the U.S. with its stronger dollar and insatiable demand.

Second, for Ann's question of do we have a responsibility to maintain non-renewables....that's tough. In the spirit of satisfying sustainability we need to leave resources for future generations. But in reality it seems that those countries with resources (oil, coal, natural gas, timber) need to exploit them to have competitive economies or risk falling behind nations who take the profits and re-invest in new technologies which will put them even further ahead. (Brian)

#53: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:21 am

Wow - so there are the issues of economic equality and environmental sustainability coming up here.

Kevin Bill wrote:

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

I remember being at a meeting at the Ministry of environment in BC and one person explained how BC Hydro was making such a profit. Since Hydroelectric stations can be turned on and off fairly easily (just release some more water from the reservoir), they would shut them down at night, and purchase power from Alberta really cheap (like 1c perKw), who had to keep their coal/gas plants running, and then during the day they would ramp up production and sell it to California for 100 times that amount.

#54: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:21 am

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

Gouvernement will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

i like this one, could they offer finacial incentives to companies that develop/produce in a "green" manner. Grants/subsidies?

Krista...are you proposing the government go into business or simply make the right climate for private parties to invest in the technologies?

#55: Author: Thien Tran,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:22 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Is it one future or many possible energy futures?

There is one school of thout that we should develop localized energy source such as hydro in Quebec; wind power in Southern Alberta; and nuclear power in Ontario ...

In my opinion, we should try to focus on finding on major energy source. In that way, we can share and/or transfer across the Provinces and then may be North America same as we do now with elctricity and natural gas

#56: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:22 am

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing inovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go allong way to securing sustainability.

Good point Steve

Canada should commit to be an energy efficient nation, through a diverse range of policies including performance standards, legislation and taxes, and incentives

#57: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:22 am

The energy policy should promote fair and stable international trade agreements that include regulations and a legal basis for the protection of Canadian resources and Canadian businesses investments.

Ann Dale wrote:

Again, a key point, don't forget that it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west, so how would this be a principle?

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

#58: Author: senglish,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:22 am

Okay,

Economically: reduced energy consumption per unit good produced

Ann Dale wrote:

Action plan material.

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing inovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go allong way to securing sustainability.

#59: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:22 am

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

Gouvernement will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

i like this one, could they offer financial incentives to companies that develop/produce in a "green" manner. Grants/subsidies?

In AB (edmonton anyway) they discontinued the ability to purchase a block of green energy (it was more of a market survey I think). Maybe following the above suggestion would make the purchase of "dirty" energy more expensive for the consumer rather than less. And by that what I really mean is slanting the field in favor of green producers rather than the other way around.

#60: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:23 am

Is part of the obstacle here also the Free Trade Agreement with US? With a more powerful dollar US companies can easily outbid many of the provinces for the purchase of Canadian goods.

Anonymous wrote:

Two points. Re: the interprovincial trading, it's good for a secure supply to have agreements in place within the country, but the difficulty is that there are greater economic benefits from exporting to the U.S. with its stronger dollar and insatiable demand.

Second, for Ann's question of do we have a responsibility to maintain non-renewables...that's tough. In the spirit of satisfying sustainability we need to leave resources for future generations. But in reality it seems that those countries with resources (oil, coal, natural gas, timber) need to exploit them to have competitive economies or risk falling behind nations who take the profits and re-invest in new technologies which will put them even further ahead. (Brian)

#61: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:24 am

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

Gouvernement will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

i like this one, could they offer financial incentives to companies that develop/produce in a "green" manner. Grants/subsidies?

I think that that is a good idea, Gov,t needs to start more incentive based programs for research and development into greener based energy. Government already gives fossil fuel burning energy producers millions of dollars in tax breaks so why not invest some of this money into greener technology.

#62: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:24 am

Amy Wilson wrote:

Things are always changing, I think we will have more than one energy future. What seems like a great idea now may not in 10 years.

Energies are more sustainable and feasible in different regions than others and since Canada is so big we can't expect what works in one area to work in another.

Good Point. I think that sustainable energy would be a bunch of different energy sources and supplies so that not all our energy sources are in one basket. Diversity is the key.

#63: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:24 am

Good point Steve regarding the building codes - it is also a key issue at the municipal level where community plans do not require energy efficient (including the reduction of water uses) within the municipality. As you mentioned changes to regulation and enforcement of law directed at the city/town/villages would be beneficial.

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing inovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go along way to securing sustainability.

#64: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:25 am

the policy should promote and provide legislative support for provincial trade of resources and technology to protect national resources and economic investements

Ann Dale wrote:

Again, a key point, don't forget that it is easier to trade energy north/south than east/west, so how would this be a principle?

suegirard wrote:

Something that I read recently also mentions the relationship between provinces. So at a national level, the principles must include the maintenance of interrelationships between provinces and a transfer of Canada's energy sources.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

security is a good point, Canada definately has to deal with the current political instabilities surrounding the middle east and our neighbors to the south. we would have to protect our national interests and development of resources while honoring our commitments to other countires, or create reasonable commitements of trade.

#65: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:25 am

Many principles have emerged, the need for innovation, diversity, equity between provinces (this is a very difficult topic), the basic need for energy by all Canadians, the need for an energy grid that facilitates the trading of energy between provinces on an equitable basis, again difficult but Kevin raised a key point in his B.C./Alberta example, as well, committment to being an energy efficient country, protection of Canadian resources and Canadian business investments, and so forth. Didn't capture them all in this brief summary but you guys did.

Well done, shall we move on to the Action Plan. Let's start with the micro actions first and try to be as detailed as possible on multiple levels.

#66: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:26 am

What about a commitment to improving education curriculum related to environmental issues. I am not sure what is out there at primary level schools, but hopefully it has improved since i was there. Improved education would lead to greater awareness and ones individual responsibility

#67: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:27 am

Government should make a commitment to promoting education and awareness amongst all Canadians in areas of reduced energy use and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

#68: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:27 am

I think a diversity energy source is necessary. Being from Ontario, however, I have some concerns with our province conerting completely to nuclear power. I actually even have some concerns with the fact that half of our supply already comes from nuclear sources. I think this point was raised in a previous discussion, but why is nuclear considered a "green" or sustainable energy source?

Thien Tran wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Is it one future or many possible energy futures?

There is one school of thout that we should develop localized energy source such as hydro in Quebec; wind power in Southern Alberta; and nuclear power in Ontario ...

In my opinion, we should try to focus on finding on major energy source. In that way, we can share and/or transfer across the Provinces and then may be North America same as we do now with elctricity and natural gas

#69: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:27 am

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

Government will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

i like this one, could they offer finacial incentives to companies that develop/produce in a "green" manner. Grants/subsidies?

Krista...are you proposing the government go into business or simply make the right climate for private parties to invest in the technologies?

Not Just Companies but to individuals that that show initiative to this end

#70: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:28 am

Tina, more general action plan item for the following half hour. At the micro level, the federal government will work with provincial government ministries of education to develop an incentive plan for the retrofitting of all educational buildings?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

What about a commitment to improving education curriculum related to environmental issues. I am not sure what is out there at primary level schools, but hopefully it has improved since i was there. Improved education would lead to greater awareness and ones individual responsibility

#71: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:28 am

Good points, so a policy should promote national investemetns in order to create jobs (social and economic prosperity).

Dawn wrote:

That's definitely important too. Equality among people, and the availability of basic nessecities for is a definite requirement to truly have a sustainable society. Unfortunately with the costs that will be associated with this transformation it is unlikely that intial funding will be devoted toward this avenue. But maybe a more diversified industry will help to create jobs and make energy more affordable.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Dawn wrote:

I think sustainable energy is a reliable, renewable energy source that can be provided economically and at a cost that will make it available to the majority of the population. In addition to this, the use of the source should not deleteriously impact the natural environment and it should not generate wastes which pose an environmental or health risk.

What about government assistance to the portion of the population that can't economically afford a sustainable form of energy?

#72: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:28 am

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

Government will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

i like this one, could they offer finacial incentives to companies that develop/produce in a "green" manner. Grants/subsidies?

Krista...are you proposing the government go into business or simply make the right climate for private parties to invest in the technologies?

As far as long term gain goes don't you think money would be better spent developing clean technology to the point where it becomes competitive with existing older technology, then market forces can take over and make the switch easily. The alternative is using the stick on dirty energy (taxes etc) I see the 1st has money better spent.

#73: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:29 am

Regulatory action has to be key in the action plan. As Daryl mentioned earlier, the government has to place a leadership role.

#74: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:29 am

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

#75: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:29 am

suegirard wrote:

Good point Steve regarding the building codes - it is also a key issue at the municipal level where community plans do not require energy efficient (including the reduction of water uses) within the municipality. As you mentioned changes to regulation and enforcement of law directed at the city/town/villages would be beneficial.

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing inovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go allong way to securing sustainability.

I think government should also make it easier for individuals who take the intitiative to reduce their ecological footprint. From what I understand, it is hard for people who install solar panels or other energy producing methods on their house to benefit from them. SOME areas allow people to 'sell'power back to the grid, and then 'buy' it back when it is a cloudy day etc.

It would be nice to harness the 24hours of daylight here in the summer and 'sell' it to the supplier, so my bills in the dark winter months (like now) would be lower.

I guess my point is individuals need the support of government as well.

#76: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:30 am

I think tings have definiely improved since I was in school. Back then it wasn't really an issue, at least where I went to school. We didn't have environmental studies, and I don't think I heard much about sustainability until I went to college. Now kids are getting in class demonstrations about hazardous wastes, groundwater contamination, and leaching from landfills. And they do offer environmental studies classes in alot of schools, and even extra curricular activities and competitions related to environmental awareness.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

What about a commitment to improving education cirriculum related to environmental issues. I am not sure what is out there at primary level schools, but hopefully it has improved since i was there. Improved education would lead to greater awareness and ones individual responsibility

#77: Author: senglish,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:30 am

Can we mandate minimum performance standards in building codes - covering things like water efficiency, triple glazed windows, insulation, energy efficient building materials (like wood), etc. on a national level

#78: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:30 am

Can you turn this into an action statement, reduction in taxes?

Kevin Bill wrote:

suegirard wrote:

Good point Steve regarding the building codes - it is also a key issue at the municipal level where community plans do not require energy efficient (including the reduction of water uses) within the municipality. As you mentioned changes to regulation and enforcement of law directed at the city/town/villages would be beneficial.

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing innovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go along way to securing sustainability.

I think government should also make it easier for individuals who take the initiative to reduce their ecological footprint. From what I understand, it is hard for people who install solar panels or other energy producing methods on their house to benefit from them. Some areas allow people to 'sell' power back to the grid, and then 'buy' it back when it is a cloudy day etc. It would be nice to harness the 24 hours of daylight here in the summer and 'sell' it to the supplier, so my bills in the dark winter months (like now) would be lower.
I guess my point is individuals need the support of government as well.

#79: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:30 am

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

kristawatts wrote:

Governement will identify and implement private sector projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

i like this one, could they offer financial incentives to companies that develop/produce in a "green" manner.
Grants/subsidies?

Krista...are you proposing the government go into business or simply make the right climate for private parties to invest in the technologies?

Definitely the latter Adrian. Creating an inviting environment for private companies to want to excel in the alternatives that are out there or be innovative and create some themselves (like we discussed in environmental economics that industry knows best how to improve the situation)

#80: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:31 am

Meghan King wrote:

Ahhh...this echos of the promotion of the One Tonne Challenge. Make each Canadian feel like they are doing their part. Challenging themselves to save money and reduce GHG

#81: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:31 am

When its election time Canidates could take a stronger stance on envuironmental issues espically in the green era that we are now living in. You don't see many paid political announcements on TV where the canidates discuss environmental issues.

#82: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:32 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Tina, more general action plan item for the following half hour. At the micro level, the federal government will work with provincial government ministries of education to develop an incentive plan for the retrofitting of all educational buildings?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

What about a commitment to improving education cirriculum related to environmental issues. I am not sure what is out there at primary level schools, but hopefully it has improved since i was there. Improved education would lead to greater awareness and ones individual responsibility

Gotcha, i am on a extremely slow computer, so probably posted before i saw your post. But how you can make this a micro level item

#83: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:33 am

Yup, but don't forget federal/provincial relations or lack of? Could be the Federal Government is committed to retrofitting all the buildings it owns by year [x] with water efficiency, triple glazed windows, insulation, HVAC systems, new fleet purchases and will make a yearly report to the Commissioner for the Environment and Sustainable Development on its progress? Can we think of something that will prompt the provinces--a task force to raise standards mutually agreed upon?

senglish wrote:

Can we mandate minimum performace standards in building codes - covering things like water efficiency, triple glased windows, insulation, energy efficient building materials (like wood), etc. on a national level

#84: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:33 am

bJjackson wrote:

Meghan King wrote:

Government should make a commitment to promoting education and awareness amongst all Canadians in areas of reduced energy use and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Ahhh...this echos of the promotion of the One Tonne Challenge. Make each Canadian feel like they are doing their part. Challenging themselves to save money and reduce GHG

Or make them feel guilty for not doing their part.

#85: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:33 am

I think this is an area where standards would be appropriate, right now there are voluntary initiatives, but if we want to see widespread results i think this is a good plan

senglish wrote:

Can we mandate minimum performace standards in building codes - covering things like water efficiency, triple glased windows, insulation, energy efficient building materials (like wood), etc. on a national level

#86: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:33 am

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Tina, more general action plan item for the following half hour. At the micro level, the federal government will work with provincial government ministries of education to develop an incentive plan for the retrofiting of all educational buildings?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

What about a commitment to improving education cirriculum related to environmental issues. I am not sure what is out there at primary level schools, but hopefully it has improved since i was there. Improved education would lead to greater awareness and ones individual responsibility

Gotcha, i am on a extremely slow computer, so probably posted before i saw your post. But how you can make this a micro level item

Ann it was suppose to say i can see how can make this a micro level item.

#87: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:35 am

I don't like the idea of solar power but I agree that individuals require incentive to reduce ecological footprint and invest in the capital required to implement renewable energy.

Kevin Bill wrote:

suegirard wrote:

Good point Steve regarding the building codes - it is also a key issue at the municipal level where community plans do not require energy efficient (including the reduction of water uses) within the municipality. As you mentioned changes to regulation and enforcement of law directed at the city/town/villages would be beneficial.

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing inovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go allong way to secureing sustainability.

I think government should also make it easier for individuals who take the initiative to reduce their ecological footprint. From what I understand, it is hard for people who install solar panels or other energy producing methods on their house to benefit from them. Some areas allow people to 'sell' power back to the grid, and then 'buy' it back when it is a cloudy day etc. It would be nice to harness the 24 hours of daylight here in the summer and 'sell' it to the supplier, so my bills in the dark winter months (like now) would be lower. I guess my point is individuals need the support of government as well.

#88: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:35 am

How about tax incentives for sustainable, responsible energy choices? and refunds to people who are paying unreasonable rates for their energy due to deregulation.

#89: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:35 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Can you turn this into an action statement, reduction in taxes?

Kevin Bill wrote:

suegirard wrote:

Good point Steve regarding the building codes - it is also a key issue at the municipal level where community plans do not require energy efficient (including the reduction of water uses) within the municipality. As you mentioned changes to regulation and enforcement of law directed at the city/town/villages would be beneficial.

senglish wrote:

One of the biggest ways to make our energy future more secure is to reduce out demand;

One comment discussed previously was the required changes to building codes, first to remove prescriptive clauses preventing innovation (energy efficiency is not really new, just forgotten). Reduced domestic energy usage will go along way to securing sustainability.

I think government should also make it easier for individuals who take the initiative to reduce their ecological footprint. From what I understand, it is hard for people who install solar panels or other energy producing methods on their house to benefit from them. Some areas allow people to 'sell' power back to the grid, and then 'buy' it back when it is a cloudy day etc.

It would be nice to harness the 24 hours of daylight here in the summer and 'sell' it to the supplier, so my bills in the dark winter months (like now) would be lower.

I guess my point is individuals need the support of government as well.

I guess the government could institute subsidies for the installation of the technologies first, maybe a rebate on federal tax returns etc. I am not sure how this could be done, however, since I think many of the energy supply companies are now privately owned or crown corporations.

Perhaps included in the energy policy would be some regulations requiring companies to allow selling back to the grid.

I am sure many more things could be included.

#90: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:35 am

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

#91: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:36 am

I think that Canada is heading in the right direction with the One Tonne Challenge idea. They are trying to let Canadians know that there are choices out there and that they can make a difference.

#92: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:36 am

Micro actions for energy security policy. I think a few people have already listed some good ones; Steve talked about reduced demand through reduced consumption, Kevin talked about being able to sell green-produced energy back to the grid, and Sue talked about the role of municipal government. I'd like to take the last point a bit further in that I think we should promote a shift in power from provincial energy utilities to more local, municipal, community-owned sources (i.e. as we read in the Soft Path). (Brian)

#93: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:36 am

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

#94: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:37 am

Conserving energy is one way to increase security. We can give incentives for reducing our energy consumption, either "pay for what you use" tax or "get paid for what you don't use" subsidy.

#95: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:37 am

transfer oil and gas subsidies to renewable energy sources. Transfer tax dollars to promote renewable energy infrastructure development.

Ann Dale wrote:

Many principles have emerged, the need for innovation, diversity, equity between provinces (this is a very difficult topic), the basic need for energy by all Canadians, the need for an energy grid that facilitates the trading of energy between provinces on an equitable basis, again difficult but Kevin raised a key point in his B.C./Alberta example, as well, commitment to being an energy efficient country, protection of Canadian resources and Canadian business investments, and so forth. Didn't capture them all in this brief summary but you guys did.

Well done, shall we move on to the Action Plan. Let's start with the micro actions first and try to be as detailed as possible on multiple levels.

#96: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:38 am

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

I agree Faron, it is 1300km for me to get to the nearest Walmart!! :-)

#97: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:39 am

Faron, I agree, I live in a rural community as well and have difficulty with this one, so there would have to be finer discriminations allowing for residence. But one of the things with living in a smaller community is that infrastructure is slower to build than in larger centres, and so one drives everywhere. Lenore and I have talked about cluster development, but that is a little outside the scope of this.

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

#98: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:39 am

Doesn't some countries in Europe have environmental taxes on items which are not in environmentally friendly packaging? I thought I remember reading this somewhere.

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

#99: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:39 am

Your right Faron. Those of us that are required to travel the furthest to get places are often also the ones that lack a reliable and efficient public transportation infrastructure. This doesn't seem fair. A reduction in property taxes for homes meeting certain energy efficiency standards, or insurance rates proportional to the vehicles emissions rating would be nice though.

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

#100: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:39 am

I think if the one tonne challenge, or other initiatives, were supported at the lower levels of govt people might get more on board. People respond faster to local issues. If the government could support local govt and organizations that are committed to increasing awareness and getting people involved we would see a greater number of people pushing towards sustainability.

dsheppard1 wrote:

I think that Canada is heading in the right direction with the One Tonne Challenge idea. They are trying to let Canadians know that there are choices out there and that they can make a difference.

#101: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:40 am

How about an agreement from all levels of government to "green it's fleet". maybe 80% of vehicles must meet specific efficiency standards by 2007?

#102: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:40 am

Great.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

transfer oil and gas subsidies to renewable energy sources. Transfer tax dollars to promote renewable energy infrastructure development.

Ann Dale wrote:

Many principles have emerged, the need for innovation, diversity, equity between provinces (this is a very difficult topic), the basic need for energy by all Canadians, the need for an energy grid that facilitates the trading of energy between provinces on an equitable basis, again difficult but Kevin raised a key point in his B.C./Alberta example, as well, commitment to being an energy efficient country, protection of Canadian resources and Canadian business investments, and so forth. Didn't capture them all in this brief summary but you guys did.

Well done, shall we move on to the Action Plan. Let's start with the micro actions first and try to be as detailed as possible on multiple levels.

#103: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:40 am

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

I like the idea of canada removing all federal taxes on smart cars, Right now they are offering a Sales Tax Reduction up to \$2000 but they can offer more.

#104: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:40 am

Kevin Bill wrote:

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

I agree Faron, it is 1300km for me to get to the nearest Walmart!! :-)

I agree with Faron/Kevin on this it sounds very big brotherish. And would lead to alot of people to play with the system. I.e. altering the odemeter

#105: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:40 am

Now, we are rockin'

Daryl Lawes wrote:

How about an agreement from all levels of government to "green it's fleet". maybe 80% of vehicles must meet specific efficiency standards by 2007??

#106: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:41 am

I agree Brian we should foster development of more community based systems. Like industrial parks that use one anothers waste as energy. The Blowing in the Wind paper discussed how the wind energy systems did better when it was user-owned.

#107: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:41 am

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

I know that in the States people can take advantage of tax breaks on certain energy efficient cars.

#108: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:41 am

Daryl Lawes wrote:

How about an agreement from all levels of government to "green it's fleet". maybe 80% of vehicles must meet specific efficiency standards by 2007?

If Parks Canada can have a Hybrid in Inuvik, government should be able to use them elsewhere.

#109: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:42 am

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

Would the gov't regulate this? How? Would they prepare a good vs bad list to ensure the "bad stuff" is taxed. I guess this would be an ever changing list with the development of new technologies. I like the idea. Tehn imported produce could be taxed and not locally grown produce, etc Encouaging the public to make better decisions by enticing their pocket book

#110: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:42 am

Exactly the government should make a commitment to renewable energies and if nothing else at least stop subsidies within non-renewable energies. Could you imagine the public outcry if we were paying the true costs.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

transfer oil and gas subsidies to renewable energy sources. Transfer tax dollars to promote renewable energy infrastructure development.

Ann Dale wrote:

Many principles have emerged, the need for innovation, diversity, equity between provinces (this is a very difficult topic), the basic need for energy by all Canadians, the need for an energy grid that facilitates the trading of energy between provinces on an equitable basis, again difficult but Kevin raised a key point in his B.C./Alberta example, as well, commitment to being an energy efficient country, protection of Canadian resources and Canadian business investments, and so forth. Didn't capture them all in this brief summary but you guys did.

Well done, shall we move on to the Action Plan. Let's start with the micro actions first and try to be as detailed as possible on multiple levels.

#111: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:42 am

Meghan King wrote:

I think if the one tonne challenge, or other initiatives, were supported at the lower levels of govt people might get more on board. People respond faster to local issues. If the government could support local govt and organizations that are committed to increasing awareness and getting people involved we would see a greater number of people pushing towards sustainability.

dsheppard1 wrote:

I think that Canada is heading in the right direction with the One Tonne Challenge idea. They are trying to let Canadians know that there are choices out there and that they can make a difference.

I think this is a great idea. You could measure public participation and set some benchmarks. Tying federal transfers to performance would get things done in a hurry

#112: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:42 am

Create the carbon tax and have the funds invested in improving public transportation systems, renewable energy infrastructure and technology, and biofuels such as ethanol.

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

#113: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:43 am

I like this idea Dawn, with the building, and renovation boom we are presently seeing, due to our low interest rates, this is an area which can impact individuals significantly while sending an educating message to the general public.

Dawn wrote:

Your right Faron. Those of us that are required to travel the furthest to get places are often also the ones that lack a reliable and efficient public transportation infrastructure. This doesn't seem fair. A reduction in property taxes for homes meeting certain energy efficiency standards, or insurance rates proportional to the vehicles emissions rating would be nice though.

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

#114: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:43 am

Amy Wilson wrote:

Conserving energy is one way to increase security. We can give incentives for reducing our energy consumption, either "pay for what you use" tax or "get paid for what you don't use" subsidy.

You could have infrastructure like income tax where there are tax brackets, you could have energy

consumption brackets (if you are a high consumer you pay more taxes)

#115: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:43 am

I don't know if this would work - since was discussed yesterday - we are completely entwined in fossil fuels - if the "bads" were taxes (fossil fuels) - this would not help us initially - we would all be paying the additional taxes before a shift could be made - I'm thinking of the larger areas of fossil fuel consumption (ie cars, energy, etc). There may be the need for subsidies - but this is getting complicated.

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

#116: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:44 am

I think this is a good idea to adopt. The rising taxes on cigarettes has been an incentive for a lot of people I know to quit smoking. If cost can help them overcome this addiction it may help us combat our dependence on unsustainable energy sources. Taxes for manufacturer's on packaging would also be a good idea. The often ridiculous use of the materials was brought up yesterday. If manufacturer's were required to pay a tax on every unit of packaging utilized they may be more inclined to look into alternative methods of marketing.

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

#117: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:44 am

We should invest in R&D of alternative, renewable, sustainable energy sources. If Canada can get a head start we can sell new technologies internationally and lead world markets in alternative energy.

#118: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:44 am

I found an article for my policy paper called "Greener public purchasing as a public policy instrument" it talks about how government spending choices can really set a good example and infuse money into sustainable products and practices

Ann Dale wrote:

Now, we are rockin'

Daryl Lawes wrote:

How about an agreement from all levels of government to "green it's fleet". maybe 80% of vehicles must meet specific efficiency standards by 2007?

#119: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:44 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Faron, I agree, I live in a rural community as well and have difficulty with this one, so there would have to be finer discriminations allowing for residence. But one of the things with living in a smaller community is that infrastructure is slower to build than in larger centres, and so one drives everywhere. Lenore and I have talked about cluster development, but that is a little outside the scope of this.

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

I bet due to living in a rural community you already drive more efficiently than us city folk, better planning your errands, so you don't drive back and forth into town. Unlike us city people that randomly drive around the city, back and forth across town.

#120: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:44 am

Excellent point - this goes into the idea of zerowaste and efficiency. We have a hard task ahead of us - getting everyone to play together nicely in Industry and politics.

Amy Wilson wrote:

I agree Brian we should foster development of more community based systems. Like industrial parks that use one anothers waste as energy. The Blowing in the Wind paper discussed how the wind energy systems did better when it was user-owned.

#121: Author: Thien Tran,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:45 am

Faron Knott wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about removing all Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids? How about insurance fees based on number of miles driven?

I like the idea of removing Federal taxes on smart cars and hybrids, but not so sure about insurance based on number of kilometers driven. I don't think this would be fair to all, especially to those of us in rural Canada

I guess we have to pay for our living style in this case.
I just read that in Europe they tax people driving into downtown and trucking through high tech of surveillant. Watch out Big Brother Watching over us.

#122: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:45 am

Anonymous wrote:

Micro actions for energy security policy. I think a few people have already listed some good ones; Steve talked about reduced demand through reduced consumption, Kevin talked about being able to sell green-produced energy back to the grid, and Sue talked about the role of municipal government. I'd like to take the last point a bit further in that I think we should promote a shift in power from provincial energy utilities to more local, municipal, community-owned sources (i.e. as we read in the Soft Path). (Brian)

I have read that these Soft Path energy producing systems are a great way to go for greener energy but they still have to have the support of local people. There was a proposal to but in a hydro-electric operation on a stream where I live and the water would be funneled through a long tunnel and then reverted back into the stream but there were fish issues downstream. It just goes to show that you have to weigh all the options.

#123: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:45 am

kristawatts wrote:

Amy Wilson wrote:

Conserving energy is one way to increase security. We can give incentives for reducing our energy consumption, either "pay for what you use" tax or "get paid for what you don't use" subsidy.

You could have infrastructure like income tax where there are tax brackets, you could have energy consumption brackets (if you are a high consumer you pay more taxes)

Again this creates an issue for the northern/rural centres who require higher energy supply because of colder climate.

#124: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:45 am

I agree that there has to be an allocation of tax dollars to the investment in sustainability. As we move towards sustainability and the tax revenue decreases, so does the need for the funds, so it's a win win situation.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Create the carbon tax and have the funds invested in improving public transportation systems, renewable energy infrastructure and technology, and biofuels such as ethanol.

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

#125: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:46 am

Out here it seems the small NGOs are waving the One Tonne Challenge flag and the province is really kinda non-existent in it. The NGOs have brought the Challenge to the community level in some parts of the Island and as for the provincial government.....well we recently bought 2 Hybrid Chev 4x4s. One is being driven by my Minister and the other for the Minister of Transportation. Really not a great use of money in my opinion.

Meghan King wrote:

I think if the one tonne challenge, or other initiatives, were supported at the lower levels of govt people might get more on board. People respond faster to local issues. If the government could support local govt and organizations that are committed to increasing awareness and getting people involved we would see a greater number of people pushing towards sustainability.

dsheppard1 wrote:

I think that Canada is heading in the right direction with the One Tonne Challenge idea. They are trying to let Canadians know that there are choices out there and that they can make a difference.

#126: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:46 am

Dawn, much better idea to tax vehicles with higher emission standards, than to tax mileage. Note everyone the reaction one has with big brother stuff.

#127: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:47 am

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

Would the gov't regulate this? How? Would they prepare a good vs bad list to ensure the "bad stuff" is taxed. I guess this would be an ever changing list with the development of new technologies. I like the idea. Then imported produce could be taxed and not locally grown produce, etc Encouraging the public to make better decisions by enticing their pocket book

This way you wouldn't necessarily need to apply further taxes. The feds net income could conceivably stay the same (theory) you would just rebalance things a little. If I were the green party or NDP I would develop this idea and make it a platform cornerstone

#128: Author: senglish,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:47 am

I am a big fan of waste to power (historically called incineration!) when used as part of a co-generation project. There are several cities in the GTA with large scale community heating systems (London, Hamilton).

Amy Wilson wrote:

I agree Brian we should foster development of more community based systems. Like industrial parks that use one another's waste as energy. The Blowing in the Wind paper discussed how the wind energy systems did better when it was user-owned.

#129: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:47 am

It definitely wouldn't be embraced by society, but it would act as a form of shock therapy to make people realize the necessity of this type of change. I guess you'd have to find a balance where people could still meet their basic needs, but would make this difficult if they chose to continue investing in unsustainable purchases. As identified in economics, the external costs need to be internalized in order to make a real

impact.

suegirard wrote:

I don't know if this would work - since was discussed yesterday - we are completely entwined in fossil fuels - if the "bads" were taxes (fossil fuels) - this would not help us initially - we would all be paying the additional taxes before a shift could be made - I'm thinking of the larger areas of fossil fuel consumption (ie cars, energy, etc). There may be the need for subsidies - but this is getting complicated.

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

#130: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:47 am

There could be a fee or a fine attached to industrial waste that could be used as an energy source for industry or homes. There could be subsidies provided to promote and create infrastructure for waste energy transfer and use.

#131: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:49 am

Anonymous wrote:

Micro actions for energy security policy. I think a few people have already listed some good ones; Steve talked about reduced demand through reduced consumption, Kevin talked about being able to sell green-produced energy back to the grid, and Sue talked about the role of municipal government. I'd like to take the last point a bit further in that I think we should promote a shift in power from provincial energy utilities to more local, municipal, community-owned sources (i.e. as we read in the Soft Path). (Brian)

I like your idea Brian, why should we sacrifice our land to large corporations when they dam a valley to make hydro-electric power and then sell it on the open grid to the US. This power is not any cheaper to us, we just pay more as we watch the prices rise everytime there is a disaster in the US. Smaller projects that are owned and operated locally are friendlier for the environment and a benefit to the people.

#132: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:50 am

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce their consumption

bljackson wrote:

Out here it seems the small NGOs are waving the One Tonne Challenge flag and the province is really kinda non-existent in it. The NGOs have brought the Challenge to the community level in some parts of the Island and as for the provincial government.....well we recently bought 2 Hybrid Chev 4x4s. One is being driven by my Minister and the other for the Minister of Transportation. Really not a great use of money in my opinion.

Meghan King wrote:

I think if the one tonne challenge, or other initiatives, were supported at the lower levels of govt people might get more on board. People respond faster to local issues. If the government could support local govt and organizations that are committed to increasing awareness and getting people involved we would see a greater number of people pushing towards sustainability.

dsheppard1 wrote:

I think that Canada is heading in the right direction with the One Tonne Challenge idea. They are trying to let Canadians know that there are choices out there and that they can make a difference.

#133: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:51 am

suegirard wrote:

I don't know if this would work - since was discussed yesterday - we are completely entwined in fossil fuels - if the "bads" were taxes (fossil fuels) - this would not help us initially - we would all be paying the additional taxes before a shift could be made - I'm thinking of the larger areas of fossil fuel consumption (ie cars, energy, etc). There may be the need for subsidies - but this is getting complicated.

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

I agree Sue... what to do in the transition period? as for complicated, things get more complicated the closer you get to implementation.

#134: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:52 am

I think where possible the electricity generating stations should be located in, or very near to, the locations they supply. This would provide the greatest benefits to local residents and make people "live" with decisions they make in regard to energy sources.

dsheppard1 wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Micro actions for energy security policy. I think a few people have already listed some good ones; Steve talked about reduced demand through reduced consumption, Kevin talked about being able to sell green-produced energy back to the grid, and Sue talked about the role of municipal government. I'd like to take the last point a bit further in that I think we should promote a shift in power from provincial energy utilities to more local, municipal, community-owned sources (i.e. as we read in the Soft Path). (Brian)

I like your idea Brian, why should we sacrifice our land to large corporations when they dam a valley to make hydro-electric power and then sell it on the open grid to the US. This power is not any cheaper to us, we just pay more as we watch the prices rise everytime there is a disaster in the US. Smaller projects that are owned and operated locally are friendlier for the environment and a benefit to the people.

#135: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:53 am

Ann Dale wrote:

In your discussion yesterday, you talked about how the cost of energy efficient lightbulbs was more expensive than the others. Again, remove taxes from the 'goods' and tax the 'bads' as Paul Hawken advocates?

I don't mind paying a little extra for these energy efficient lighting because they last longer and offer cheaper light; the problem with these lights are that most of the light emitted is harsh and cold. I have some of these in my home and its like walking into a department store, the warm feeling of incandescent

lights is more appealing.

#136: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:53 am

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implamenting renewable energy

#137: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:54 am

I also found an article for my policy paper that is titled Why Renewable Energy is not cheap and not green. It is US based and talks about what the role of renewables and conservation in a restructured electricity industry might be.

Meghan King wrote:

I found a article for my policy paper called "Greener public purchasing as apublic policy instrument" it talks about how government spending choices can really set a good example and infuse money into sustainable products and practices

Ann Dale wrote:

Now, we are rockin'

Daryl Lawes wrote:

How about an agreemant from all levels of government to "green it's fleet". maybe 80% of vehicles must meet specific efficiency standards by 2007?

#138: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:54 am

Meghan, that is what we should be trying to do in this action plan, try to shift behaviour without appearing to be big brother, my problem with the one tonne challenge is that it is not tied to incentives?

Meghan King wrote:

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce thier consumption

#139: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:54 am

Dawn wrote:

I think where possible the electricity generating stations should be located in, or very near to, the locations they supply. This would provide the greatest benefits to local residents and make people "live" with decisions they make in regard to energy sources.

dsheppard1 wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Micro actions for energy security policy. I think a few people have already listed some good ones; Steve talked about reduced demand through reduced consumption, Kevin talked about being able to sell green-produced energy back to the grid, and Sue talked about the role of municipal government. I'd like

to take the last point a bit further in that I think we should promote a shift in power from provincial energy utilities to more local, municipal, community-owned sources (i.e. as we read in the Soft Path). (Brian)

I like your idea Brian, why should we sacrifice our land to large corporations when they dam a valley to make hydro-electric power and then sell it on the open grid to the US. This power is not any cheaper to us , we just pay more as we watch the prices rise everytime there is a disaster in the US. Smaller projects that are owned and operated locally are friendlier for the environment and a benefit to the people.

It would also reduce the loss of energy over the long transmission lines.

#140: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:54 am

A fee based on the amount of waste discharged rather than the current standards of a level of allowable discharge concentration or amount. It's a way to motivate industry, including energy producers, to reduce emissions for economic reasons rather than ethical directives.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

There could be a fee or a fine attached to industrial waste that could be used as an energy source for industry or homes. There could be subsidies provided to promote and create infrastructure for waste energy transfer and use.

#141: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:56 am

Sustainable Development 100 should be a necessary options for all university students. It would help make the minds of the future more informed even if they end up being accountants or nurses they will still have the basics ideas.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implementing renewable energy

#142: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:56 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Meghan, that is what we should be trying to do in this action plan, try to shift behaviour without appearing to be big brother, my problem with the one tonne challenge is that it is not tied to incentives?

Meghan King wrote:

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce thier consumption

As I said earlier, it is based more on guilt.

#143: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:56 am

Good point Amy - the Soft article mentioned that although there is inventions/innovation there is a lack of avenues for the review/research into them. So an action plan would be to provide avenues for the exchange of ideas and resreach into alternative sources of energy.

Amy Wilson wrote:

We should invest in R&D of alternative, renewable, sustainable energy sources. If Canada can get a head start we can sell new technologies internationally and lead world markets in alternative energy.

#144: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:56 am

Okay, let's move to the more general--research and development, current subsidy systems, and education of the general public. Try to be as specific as possible. As you can see, it ain't easy in the Privy Council Office:)

#145: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:57 am

Jodi, good point colleges should be used as hands on learning, and r&D centres for the study of renewable energies. This is something that I talk to my favorite college teacher about. Our own demonstration centre that could be used to show the locals that renewable energy does work and create a learning environment for the professionals who are developing this. We already addressed that it won't be the same in every area and it won't be the same throughout time so this allows a place for change.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implementing renewable energy

#146: Author: Monica,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:57 am

Exactly. The government is doing a great job of marketing and I'm sure that there is great awareness of the program, but I think it is extremely inefficient, and I'm not very confident in the response.

Sorry everyone, this is a great discussion, but unfortunately, I have to sign off, as I have to get my daughter to her doctors appointment.

Ann Dale wrote:

Meghan, that is what we should be trying to do in this action plan, try to shift behaviour without appearing to be big brother, my problem with the one tonne challenge is that it is not tied to incentives?

Meghan King wrote:

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce thier consumption

#147: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:57 am

tax dollars could be spent on funds for companies who whould put into place the infastructure of

renewable energy

#148: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:58 am

And we all know what we do when we feel guilty, most of us are shamed and retreat and do nothing.

Kevin Bill wrote:

As I said earlier, it is based more on guilt.

#149: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:59 am

Kevin Bill wrote:

Daryl Lawes wrote:

How about an agreement from all levels of government to "green it's fleet". maybe 80% of vehicles must meet specific efficiency standards by 2007?

If Parks Canada can have a Hybrid in Inuvik, government should be able to use them elsewhere.

Good Point, If government wants to take a lead role in developing laws and regulations in protecting the environment they should take part in these programs. Government owned corporations like BC hydro and others throughout Canada can start by replacing their fleets with hybrid vehicles. I think that makes good sense.

#150: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:59 am

This is off topic but I tried to get the pdf of the first e-dialogue and it didn't work. Has anyone else experienced that problem and Anne do you know if it is possible to post it somewhere else?

#151: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:59 am

One problem I have with current subsidy systems, and this seems to be becoming a common theme for me, is that nuclear energy in Ontario receives green energy incentives. Not only do I feel these subsidies are ill-directed, but I think they diminish public faith in policies directed toward "green" initiatives.

#152: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 10:59 am

Great ideas, what about creating a network of R&D in universities and colleges and community demonstration projects?

kimwright wrote:

Jodi, good point colleges should be used as hands on learning, and r&D centres for the study of renewable energies. This is something that I talk to my favorite college teacher about. Our own demonstration centre that could be used to show the locals that renewable energy does work and create a learning environment for the professionals who are developing this. We already addressed that it won't be the same in every area and it won't be the same throughout time so this allows a place for change.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implamenting renewable energy

#153: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:00 am

Meghan King wrote:

Sustainable Development 100 should be a necessary options for all university students. It would help make the minds of the future more informed even if they end up being accountants or nurses they will still have the basics ideas.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implamenting renewable energy

I would start the program in kindergarten and have it follow through to high school

#154: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:00 am

Kevin Bill wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Meghan, that is what we should be trying to do in this action plan, try to shift behaviour without appearing to be big brother, my problem with the one tonne challenge is that it is not tied to incentives?

Meghan King wrote:

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce thier consumption

As I said earlier, it is based more on guilt.

I don't know kev, I thinks it's based more on awareness and empowerment. Giving people options and the ability to contribute to solutions. I thought it was a great start

#155: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:01 am

right, the only way to influence big business is through economics.

Monica wrote:

A fee based on the amount of waste discharged rather than the current standards of a level of allowable discharge concentration or amount. It's a way to modivate industry, including energy producers, to reduce emissions for economic reasons rather than ethical directives.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

There could be a fee or a fine attached to industrial waste that could be used as an energy source for industry or homes. There could be subsidies provided to promote and create infastructure for waste energy transfer and use.

#156: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:01 am

Dawn, you raise a critical point here, can you turn it into an action plan item? Government will provide incentives/tax relief? to energy providers who have disposable waste systems in place?

Dawn wrote:

One problem I have with current subsidy systems, and this seems to be becoming a common theme for me, is that nuclear energy in Ontario receives green energy incentives. Not only do I feel these subsidies are ill-directed, but I think they diminish public faith in policies directed toward "green" initiatives.

#157: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:01 am

There should be commercials on tv educating people on how limited our ff supply is (scaring them a bit) and then provide the alternatives and initiatives Canada is taking for Renew. res. Bombard people with information.

Ann Dale wrote:

Okay, let's move to the more general--research and development, current subsidy systems, and education of the general public. Try to be as specific as possible. As you can see, it ain't easy in the Privy Council Office:)

#158: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:02 am

Rewarding individuals may be very hard to administer from a federal level, but if we could promote the changes advocated by things like the one tonne challenge and link them to rewards at the municipal level it may work. For example, a community may want to raise money for a new recreation facility, and there is a grant available to municipalities that reduce the energy use by a certain percentage. This way people in the community would be encouraging others in the community to work towards a common goal.

Ann Dale wrote:

Meghan, that is what we should be trying to do in this action plan, try to shift behaviour without appearing to be big brother, my problem with the one tonne challenge is that it is not tied to incentives?

Meghan King wrote:

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce their consumption

#159: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:03 am

Daryl Lawes wrote:

Kevin Bill wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Meghan, that is what we should be trying to do in this action plan, try to shift behaviour without appearing to be big brother, my problem with the one tonne challenge is that it is not tied to incentives?

Meghan King wrote:

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce thier consumption

As I said earlier, it is based more on guilt.

I don't know kev, I thinks it's based more on awareness and empowerment. Giving people options and the ability to contribute to solutions. I thought it was a great start

Your right for some people, but I still think a lot of people won't bother to do anything unless there is a direct benefit to them (i.e. cash in the pocket)

#160: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:03 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Great ideas, what about creating a network of R&D in universities and colleges and community demonstration projects?

kimwright wrote:

Jodi, good point colleges should be used as hands on learning, and r&D centres for the study of renewable energies. This is something that I talk to my favorite college teacher about. Our own demonstration centre that could be used to show the locals that renewable energy does work and create a learning environement for the professionals who are developing this. We already addressed that it won't be the same in every area and it won't be the same throughout time so this allows a place for change.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implmenting renewable energy

Do engineering students, architechs etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

#161: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:04 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Okay, let's move to the more general--research and development, current subsidy systems, and education of the general public. Try to be as specific as possible. As you can see, it ain't easy in the Privy Council Office:)

I think the model of centralized R&D facilities that can be used by private corporations has worked well in the past. Edmonton has this Centre for Excellence research facility that is federally funded and is open to corporations to use. The feds get money back as a return on investment after the technology in question is put into use. The U of A staffs it with Coop students to do the lab work. I think this is an awesome example of P3s in action

#162: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:04 am

Hi Krista,

I saved the pdf version of yesterdays - then opened it, it doesn't open otherwise.

kristawatts wrote:

This is off topic but I tried to get the pdf of the first e-dialogue and it didn't work. Has anyone else experienced that problem and Anne do you know if it is possible to post it somewhere else?

#163: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:05 am

I think it would be great to something done in Ft. McMurray, where profits from fossil fuels could be used to advance the sustainable energy technology. Rather than Vitoria or Toronto.

Ann Dale wrote:

Great ideas, what about creating a network of R&D in universities and colleges and community demonstration projects?

kimwright wrote:

Jodi, good point colleges should be used as hands on learning, and r&D centres for the study of renewable energies. This is something that I talk to my favorite college teacher about. Our own demonstration centre that could be used to show the locals that renewable energy does work and create a learning environment for the professionals who are developing this. We already addressed that it won't be the same in every area and it won't be the same throughout time so this allows a place for change.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implamenting renewable energy

#164: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:05 am

An action plan item...applications in regard to subsidies for alternative and green energy progrmas will be awarded on the basis that the etchnology meets specific criteria in regard to the renewability of the source, the methods utilized to generate the technology necessary for the source and it's utilization, and the ability to reuse associated waste products, or dispose of them in a way that does not pose a helath or environmental threat. I know, saying it's easy. Developing the criteria to make these distinctions would be the hard part.

Ann Dale wrote:

Dawn, you raise a critical point here, can you turn it into an action plan item? Government will provide incentives/tax relief? to energy providers who have disposable waste systems in place?

Dawn wrote:

One problem I have with current subsidy systems, and this seems to be becoming a common theme for me, is that nuclear energy in Ontario receives green energy incentives. Not only do I feel theses subsidies are ill-directed, but I think they diminish public faith in policies directed toward "green" initives.

#165: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:05 am

I agree but it might soon turn into a comparison to religion being taught in school. Can we impose our ethics that we believe to be correct on other peoples children when outside of the home. But by inaction in this department is the resulting learning environment teaching them "bads".

Faron Knott wrote:

Meghan King wrote:

Sustainable Development 100 should be a necessary options for all university students. It would help make the minds of the future more informed even if they end up being accountants or nurses they will still have the basics ideas.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implamenting renewable energy

I would start the program in kindergarten and have it follow through to high school

#166: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:06 am

As mentioned we should switch subsidies from oil and gas industries to alternative energies. Competition is huge in the energy industry. New and emerging technologies will make solar and wind power generators (for example) more competitive, but during the early stages they need subsidies and R&D investment to catch up.

#167: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:06 am

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:**Ann Dale wrote:**

Great ideas, what about creating a network of R&D in universities and colleges and community demonstration projects?

kimwright wrote:

Jodi, good point colleges should be used as hands on learning, and r&D centres for the study of renewable energies. This is something that I talk to my favorite college teacher about. Our own demonstration centre that could be used to show the locals that renewable energy does work and create a learning environment for the professionals who are developing this. We already addressed that it won't be the same in every area and it won't be the same throughout time so this allows a place for change.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implamenting renewable energy

Do engineering students, architechs etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

Good point Tina, we can talk about better designs for buildings etc, but if the people designing them don't have the know-how, it will still be an issue.

#168: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:07 am

Hi all

I only have a chance to pop in for a minute. On research; Canada should also be actively participating with the international community to R&D new energy futures. The international research on fusion comes to

mind.

shawn samborsky wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Okay, let's move to the more general--research and development, current subsidy systems, and education of the general public. Try to be as specific as possible. As you can see, it ain't easy in the Privy Council Office:)

I think the model of centralized R&D facilities that can be used by private corporations has worked well in the past. Edmonton has this Centre for Excellence research facility that is federally funded and is open to corporations to use. The feds get money back as a return on investment after the technology in question is put into use. The U of A staffs it with Coop students to do the lab work. I think this is an awesome example of P3s in action

#169: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:07 am

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

#170: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:08 am

perhaps there could be research and development sharing agreements across the borders, conferences and large incentives and tax breaks for these types of educations and technologies.

A few years ago there was alot of money available for forestry studies if you were an unemployed forestry worker (thats how I went to college), mabey there could be the same incentives for reserch and d. in Renewables.

#171: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:08 am

Faron Knott wrote:

Meghan King wrote:

Sustainable Development 100 should be a necessary options for all university students. It would help make the minds of the future more informed even if they end up being accountants or nurses they will still have the basics ideas.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implamenting renewable energy

I would start the program in kindergarten and have it follow through to high school

Absolutely, Faron. I think that what is lacking in our current education system is context. I think that

children (people) need to be taught more than just the basics in school, all the theory, and have a course or unifying theme that explains how the world works, where our electricity comes from, how water arrives at the tap, and all the effects this has "out there" in the environment. Why not explain more about how society works, how the goods we use are produced and moved...I think kids could understand these principles.

#172: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:09 am

These subsidies should be objective based, to drive innovation, such that we may set a desired percent of renewable energy by 2010 and subsidies will be given to those companies meeting the criteria.

Amy Wilson wrote:

As mentioned we should switch subsidies from oil and gas industries to alternative energies. Competition is huge in the energy industry. New and emerging technologies will make solar and wind power generators (for example) more competitive, but during the early stages they need subsidies and R&D investment to catch up.

#173: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:09 am

If govt began to foster the development of greener buildings and communities it is likely that universities and business would respond by looking into these areas of research, study and development.

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

#174: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:09 am

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

Maybe the government could develop a recognition program for students or professionals that are designing infrastructure in a sustainable manner. Turn into to a pride thing!

#175: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:10 am

Have students sign a contract to work on sustainable energy projects for a year following graduation; waiving their student loans in return.

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

#176: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:11 am

Good point Ann, at the professional level (as a professional of an association) there could a statement in their mandate to strive towards sustainability. As part of that association, they would require to at least recognize that sustainability is an issue.

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

#177: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:11 am

Course in sustainable architecture and building practices should be a must for these types of programs. They should have to research the theories and ideas of sustainable architecture and buildings designed with the intent of diverse future uses so they do not need to be demolished when their initial purpose is served.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Great ideas, what about creating a network of R&D in universities and colleges and community demonstration projects?

kimwright wrote:

Jodi, good point colleges should be used as hands on learning, and R&D centres for the study of renewable energies. This is something that I talk to my favorite college teacher about. Our own demonstration centre that could be used to show the locals that renewable energy does work and create a learning environment for the professionals who are developing this. We already addressed that it won't be the same in every area and it won't be the same throughout time so this allows a place for change.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Some tax dollars could be directed to creating higher education programs for developing renewable energy. Wind turbines 101...foster the brain power of Canadians and create leaders in implementing renewable energy

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

#178: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:12 am

How about more co-op programs linked to these programs?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

Maybe the government could develop a recognition program for students or professionals that are designing infrastructure in a sustainable manner. Turn into a pride thing!

#179: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:12 am

The U of Calgary engineering dept takes part in this big Solar car race against competitors from all over the world. The cars aren't particularly practical but they always make the news and it is a big thing to be chosen to the design team. Increases interests and awareness

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

Maybe the government could develop a recognition program for students or professionals that are designing infrastructure in a sustainable manner. Turn into a pride thing!

#180: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:12 am

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

I understand that people don't like being told what to do, but students always have mandatory curriculum they have to take, if sustainable development was added into some of these programs at least our future

professionals would be aware of the problems and potential solutions that exist. There should almost be a sustainable development engineer.

#181: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:14 am

Mc Donalds should have a pump at the back and fill up converted biofuel cars with french fry oil.

#182: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:14 am

How about government driving a Council of Energy Efficiency Champions composed of business leaders and civil society types committed to diffusing knowledge to their peers?

suegirard wrote:

Good point Ann, at the professional level (as a professional of an association) there could a statement in their mandate to strive towards sustainability. As part of that association, they would require to at least recognize that sustainability is an issue.

Ann Dale wrote:

No, Tina, they don't, and don't forget that people don't like being told what to do. Choice is very important to people. Can you think about turning this into a positive, perhaps governments will try to stimulate communities of practice among professional associations?

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Do engineering students, architects etc have to take any type of sustainable development courses? They should, they will be the ones designing our future infrastructure?

#183: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:15 am

That would be awesome!!!

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Mc Donalds should have a pump at the back and fill up converted biofuel cars with french fry oil.

#184: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:17 am

With that...businesses advertize their use of renewables. A sort of a recognition of excellence. McDonalds and excellence, well....something of the sort.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Mc Donalds should have a pump at the back and fill up converted biofuel cars with french fry oil.

#185: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:17 am

Any ideas about how to encourage more innovation?

#186: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:19 am

I think it was johnny, if your out there, correct me if I am wrong, that bio-fuel like this type is a very "dirty" burning fuel and creates more air quality issues.

Meghan King wrote:

That would be awesome!!!

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Mc Donalds should have a pump at the back and fill up converted biofuel cars with french fry oil.

#187: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:19 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Any ideas about how to encourage more innovation?

I know everyone is driven by money but what about Awards of Prestige or Excellence in your area of discipline or industry.

#188: Author: Guest,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:20 am

By the way, that was me (Brian) with the comment on education in context responding to Faron. As far as R&D and subsidies / incentives...I spent the last 3 days training in sediment and erosion control on city-owned land out in the boonies and had a first hand opportunity to check out what the City of Surrey was doing for testing out different types of erosion control ideas. I was impressed with the amount of land that environmental R&D takes, not to mention labour, time, materials and the work of engineers and other professionals that could have gone to addressing some other problem. I guess my point is that subsidies from the provincial and federal government should certainly be promoted and I wonder about involving more community members / groups to take the pressure of municipal resources and workers. Not to mention that this would get more public support and produce further ideas. BG

#189: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:21 am

Availability of grants and/or a platform where innovators could meet with prospective clients (connects those who do and those who need).

Ann Dale wrote:

Any ideas about how to encourage more innovation?

#190: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:22 am

I think advertizing what we already have as far as technology...the media could provide commercials showing our advances on wind power... and make a statement that says we require more investment in

research development an inovation.

Ann Dale wrote:

Any ideas about how to encourage more innovation?

#191: Author: Meghan King, ▣Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:22 am

I think scholarship and research grant programs would be great for students. Even at the younger levels kids could compete in a science fair type thing for environemtnal issues and be awarded money for their schools.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Any ideas about how to encourage more innovation?

I know everyone is driven by money but what about Awards of Prestige or Excellence in your area of discipline or industry.

#192: Author: Dawn, ▣Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:22 am

Good idea Jodi. Maybe tax breaks for companies showing significant investments in viable R&D of sustainable technologies would foster more innovation.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

perhaps there could be research and development sharing agreements across the boarders, conferences and large incentives and tax breakes for these types of educations and technologies.

A few years ago there was alot of money available for forestry studies if you were an unemployed forestry worker (thats how I went to college), mabey there could be the same incentives for reserch and d. in Renewables.

#193: Author: Ann Dale, ▣Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:23 am

Good ideas, stimulating more strategic partnerships between researchers, and municipalities, a level that we often don't work with?

Anonymous wrote:

By the way, that was me (Brian) with the comment on education in context responding to Faron. As far as R&D and subsidies / incentives...I spent the last 3 days training in sediment and erosion control on city-owned land out in the boonies and had a first hand opportunity to check out what the City of Surrey was doing for testing out different types of erosion control ideas. I was impressed with the amount of land that environmental R&D takes, not to mention labour, time, materials and the work of engineers and other professionals that could have gone to addressing some other problem. I guess my point is that subsidies from the provincial and federal government should certainly be promoted and I wonder about involving more community members / groups to take the pressure of municipal resources and workers. Not to mention that this would get more public support and produce further ideas. BG

#194: Author: Ann Dale, ▣Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:24 am

A carbon tax, of which half is devoted to these types of incentives?

Dawn wrote:

Good idea Jodi. Maybe tax breaks for companies showing significant investments in viable R&D of sustainable technologies would foster more innovation.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

perhaps there could be research and development sharing agreements across the boarders, conferences and large incentives and tax breakes for these types of educations and technologies.

A few years ago there was alot of money available for forestry studies if you were an unemployed forestry worker (thats how I went to college), mabey there could be the same incentives for reserch and d. in Renewables.

#195: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:25 am

Great ideas. Encouragement would have to be linked to rewards (money, fame), we could try to give money as reward for innovative developments that has to be put towards further developments

#196: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:25 am

Subsidizes spots in adverstising sustainable projects or products--giving companies free opportunities at public recognition, therefore promoting their name and their product

#197: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:26 am

Good thinking, get the good news out to the public, rather than doom and gloom coupled with awards.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Subsidizes spots in adverstising sustainable projects or products--giving companies free opportunities at public recognition, therefore promoting their name and their product

#198: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:27 am

Ann Dale wrote:

Good ideas, stimulating more strategic partnerships between researchers, and municipalities, a level that we often don't work with?

Anonymous wrote:

By the way, that was me (Brian) with the comment on education in context responding to Faron. As far as R&D and subsidies / incentives...I spent the last 3 days training in sediment and erosion control on city-owned land out in the boonies and had a first hand opportunity to check out what the City of Surrey was doing for testing out different types of erosion control ideas. I was impressed with the amount of land that environmental R&D takes, not to mention labour, time, materials and the work of engineers and other professionals that could have gone to addressing some other problem. I guess my point is that subsidies from the provincial and federal government should certainly be promoted and I wonder about involving more community members / groups to take the pressure of municipal resources and workers. Not to mention that this would get more public support and produce further ideas. BG

I think that we must also ensure that the researchers are investigating areas that have been highlighted by the public and/or government. From my experience the focus of research is often led by personal interest of the researchers, not necessarily what society feels the focus should be.

Providing grants for research in specific areas could alleviate this 'bias'.

#199: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:27 am

I like this idea to get the community involved. How about similar to a National forestry day, we could have National Renewable Resources Day and have community events and food with no petroleum and music and fun! and events where people could get involved.

Anonymous wrote:

By the way, that was me (Brian) with the comment on education in context responding to Faron. As far as R&D and subsidies / incentives...I spent the last 3 days training in sediment and erosion control on city-owned land out in the boonies and had a first hand opportunity to check out what the City of Surrey was doing for testing out different types of erosion control ideas. I was impressed with the amount of land that environmental R&D takes, not to mention labour, time, materials and the work of engineers and other professionals that could have gone to addressing some other problem. I guess my point is that subsidies from the provincial and federal government should certainly be promoted and I wonder about involving more community members / groups to take the pressure of municipal resources and workers. Not to mention that this would get more public support and produce further ideas. BG

#200: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:28 am

Perhaps run through a renewable energy board which receives applications from communities, institutions, or private companies?

Ann Dale wrote:

A carbon tax, of which half is devoted to these types of incentives?

Dawn wrote:

Good idea Jodi. Maybe tax breaks for companies showing significant investments in viable R&D of sustainable technologies would foster more innovation.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

perhaps there could be research and development sharing agreements across the borders, conferences and large incentives and tax breaks for these types of educations and technologies.

A few years ago there was alot of money available for forestry studies if you were an unemployed forestry worker (thats how I went to college), mabey there could be the same incentives for reserch and d. in Renewables.

#201: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:28 am

That's a great idea Ann. Not only would it encourage Research and Development, public support of the subsidies will be easier to obtain if they are funded by industry taxes rather than personal ones. It would also provide an added incentive for Research and Development and probably accelerate the transition from unsy=sustainable technologies.

Ann Dale wrote:

A carbon tax, of which half is devoted to these types of incentives?

Dawn wrote:

Good idea Jodi. Maybe tax breaks for companies showing significant investments in viable R&D of sustainable technologies would foster more innovation.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

perhaps there could be research and development sharing agreements across the borders, conferences and large incentives and tax breaks for these types of educations and technologies.

A few years ago there was alot of money available for forestry studies if you were an unemployed forestry worker (thats how I went to college), mabey there could be the same incentives for reserch and d. in Renewables.

#202: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:30 am

This would also be a good way to get youth involved. Maybe it could count as the community hours now required for a high school diploma. It would also be a great way for college and university students or recent grads to get some experience and working knowledge.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I like this idea to get the community involved. How about similar to a National forestry day, we could have National Renewable Resources Day and have community events and food with no petroleum and music and fun! and events where people could get involved.

Anonymous wrote:

By the way, that was me (Brian) with the comment on education in context responding to Faron. As far as R&D and subsidies / incentives...I spent the last 3 days training in sediment and erosion control on city-owned land out in the boonies and had a first hand opportunity to check out what the City of Surrey was doing for testing out different types of erosion control ideas. I was impressed with the amount of land that environmental R&D takes, not to mention labour, time, materials and the work of engineers and other professionals that could have gone to addressing some other problem. I guess my point is that subsidies from the provincial and federal government should certainly be promoted and I wonder about involving more community members / groups to take the pressure of municipal resources and workers. Not to mention that this would get more public support and produce further ideas. BG

#203: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:32 am

One of the things I have learned from my Privy Council team is the need to distribute the incentives and tax shifting equitably between individuals and the private sector, in an integrated fashion. Also great ideas about trying to 'celebrate' conserving of natural resources through community events. Let's wrap up this fascinating discussion now and get on with our personal lives on a Saturday. Last comments, everyone, and thank you.

#204: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:33 am

Meghan King wrote:

Rewarding individuals may be very hard to administer from a federal level, but if we could promote the changes advocated by things like the one tonne challenge and link them to rewards at the municipal level it may work. For example, a community may want ot raise money for a new recreation facility, and their is a grant available to municipalities that reduce the energy use by a certain percentage. This way people in the community would be encouraging others in the community to work towards a common goal.

Good Point

Terrace has proposed a second sheet of ice to our local arena and a conference center to be built between that and our pool. The town wanted to instal geo-thermal power and was given a grant by he federal government to install the system. I am sorry I could not find any figures on how much was given.

Ann Dale wrote:

Meghan, that is what we should be trying to do in this action plan, try to shift behaviour without appearing to be big brother, my problem with the one tonne challenge is that it is not tied to incentives?

Meghan King wrote:

I was thinking maybe the energy use of municipal districts could be tracked based on per capita use (scored regionally to account for areas of more severe weather) and then government money could be awarded to districts that are making efforts to reduce their consumption

#205: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:33 am

Another great discussion everyone. Have a good weekend!

#206: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:36 am

Thanks everyone, great discussion!

#207: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:37 am

Good weekend, one and all. Look forward to talking to you again.

#208: Author: suegirard,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:38 am

Thanks - have a good weekend.

#209: Author: dsheppard1,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:39 am

Meghan King wrote:

I think scholarship and research grant programs would be great for students. Even at the younger levels kids could compete in a science fair type thing for environmental issues and be awarded money for their schools.

I like the idea of scholarships for people entering university. Maybe these young adults could write essays regarding sustainability and the scholarship can be for environmental management programs that certain universities offer.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Any ideas about how to encourage more innovation?

I know everyone is driven by money but what about Awards of Prestige or Excellence in your area of discipline or industry.

#210: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Sat Nov 19, 2005 11:40 am

Have a nice weekend. See you all next time.
Kim.

Page 1 of 1

printer-friendly topic mod

Powered by phpBB2.0.11 ©