


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

Royal Roads -> ES322 - #2 What can individuals do to change energy usage patterns, and what can they not do? -> Welcome

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

#1: Welcome Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 3:55 pm


Hi everyone. Five minutes to get popcorn ready, go to the bathroom, that sort of thing. I will post a question in a few minutes...

#2: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 3:58 pm


Crack your knuckles, fingers on your mouses, rub your bleary eyes and lets roll

#3: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:00 pm

Tonight the general topic is what can and can't the individual do to change energy production and consumption. I want to start by having people answer a rather simple but subtle question. Where in our lives do we use fossil fuels? Let's try to come up with as many as we can. We can call it "find the oil"

#4: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:00 pm

Hello all
Amy

#5: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:00 pm

just checking to see if i am a guest tonight

#6: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:02 pm

Faron Knott wrote:


just checking to see if i am a guest tonight

It looks like you have your identity back Faron

#7: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

Oh so many places


looking around...
soles of my shoes
plastics
the asphalt outside my window (sigh)

#8: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

DRIVING!!!!

Lenore Newman wrote:

Tonight the general topic is what can and can't the individual do to change energy production and consumption. I want to start by having people answer a rather simple but subtle question. Where in our lives do we use fossil fuels? Let's try to come up with as many as we can. We can call it "find the oil"

#9: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

Cars and heating are the major uses.

#10: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

we use fossil fuels in motor fuels and oils, heating sources, purchase products made from industries that use fossil fuels as energy sources, and use products made from fossil fuels.

#11: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Tonight the general topic is what can and can't the individual do to change energy production and consumption. I want to start by having people answer a rather simple but subtle question. Where in our lives do we use fossil fuels? Let's try to come up with as many as we can. We can call it "find the oil"

hello everybody, i'm just on for a short time tonight but will be back tomorrow.

as for lenore's question, i guess the most obvious and simple answer is transportation

#12: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

fossil fuels are used by the overusage of vehicles, home heating, use of appliances and an overconsumption of water

#13: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

Hi everyone.
I think the question might be where don't we use oil.

A few areas where we do are:

transportation

heating

industrial production (both for fuel for production and during the production process, like for plastics)

#14: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:03 pm

We use fossil fuels for a variety of activities in our lives. I guess the big one is driving, but coal still provides us with a lot of electricity and we use electricity for pretty much everything from lights to cooling our food to heating our houses and to running our businesses. Our society would be at a stand still without fossil fuels. It would be interesting to have a glimpse at the world if we had never harnessed this source of power though.

#15: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:04 pm

Fossil fuels are used pretty much everywhere. They are used to make roads, plastics, energy for every thing I am using right now, my house is made from materials and filled with things that all required energy to make, build, and use....

#16: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:04 pm

Where do I use fossil fuels? Unfortunately this is probably going to be a long list. Number one is definitely transportation. Mainly road, but air travel too. My own, and that required to transport food and all of the other products I buy. Even the boat and lawnmower I guess.

#17: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:04 pm

I use a lot of fossil fuel (or Air Canada does) to make my way to BC in May for this program. And Dimetree has that big van to fill up.....

#18: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:04 pm

Eating. The consumption of goods that require transportation.

#19: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:05 pm

Where we use fossil fuel: directly through natural gas to heat our homes, gasoline / diesel in our vehicles, plastics in so many of the packaging and products in our houses, plus all of the wonderful petroleum-based clothing we wear like fleece, polypropylene, etc....then indirectly I guess we could stretch it and say that fossil fuel is used in pesticide manufacturing, fuelling farm machinery, manufacturing fertilizers, etc. so that ultimately fossil fuels are used throughout all aspects of our society. Am I a "guest" today? (Brian Grasser).

#20: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:05 pm

I think even chapstick, lipstick and facial creams

#21: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:05 pm

To make a very general statement: We use fossil fuels in every area that requires energy of any sort. Not to rephrase but if you can think of something to do other than simple self propelled actions (riding a bike e.g.) it probably takes energy which fossil fuels produces.

I Think a good way of thinking about is whate state would our lives be in if FFs were taken away immediately. I think life would may look similar to the bronze age. I don't think the 1800's would even be possible as we have no technology that can be adapted to lower quality fuel sources like wood and coal.

#22: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:06 pm

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

fossil fuels are used by the overusage of vehicles, home heating, use of appliances and an overconsumption of water

Hi Tina !
overconsumtion of water?

#23: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:06 pm

Good point Johnny, that not only do we use fossil fuel directly but indirectly to make a variety of products in our day to day life.

#24: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:06 pm

Good so far, but you are still missing a major catagory...

#25: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:06 pm

Even though I try to be as low impact as possible - I'm afraid I'm a user. Transportation, my favorite fleece clothing, plastic containers and other packaging....the list is almost endless.

#26: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:06 pm

Like Kevin said, where don't we used oil in our lives?

#27: Author: Thien Tran,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:06 pm

It is hard to think of where we don't use fossil oil since we are using the source of energy in almost everything in our daily life: driving, heating home, cooking, lighting ...

#28: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:07 pm

Kevin Bill wrote:

Hi everyone.
I think the question might be where don't we use oil.
A few areas where we do are:
transportation
heating
industrial production (both for fuel for production and during the production process, like for plastics)

i think that was a great question...it would be a harder discussion if we answered where DON'T we use fossil fuels. as it is obvious already our existence is based on the use of fossil fuels

#29: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:07 pm

Anonymous wrote:

To make a very general statement: We use fossil fuels in every area that requires energy of any sort. Not to rephrase but if you can think of something to do other than simple self propelled actions (riding a bike e.g.) it probably takes energy which fossil fuels produce.

I think a good way of thinking about it is what state would our lives be in if FFs were taken away immediately. I think life would look similar to the bronze age. I don't think the 1800's would even be possible as we have no technology that can be adapted to lower quality fuel sources like wood and coal.

#30: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:07 pm

Gas for cars, snowmobiles, lawn mowers snow blowers, Home heating oil, all petro based cleaning solutions, to name a few

#31: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:08 pm

Someone touched on the other major one- food in the form of transport and fertilizer. Fertilizer is actually one of the biggest, next to transport and energy. PS. If you are on as a guest identify each post with initials.

#32: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:08 pm

Transportation is definitely the largest contributor to an individual's fossil fuel use, but also being a resident of Alberta where coal is the main fuel source in the production of electricity, I guess that makes the list pretty long, and I have to then count everytime I turn on a light switch, as well as turn on a "hot water" tap in my home.

#33: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:08 pm

Johnny wrote:

Fossil fuels are used pretty much everywhere. They are used to make roads, plastics, energy for every thing I am using right now, my house is made from materials and filled with things that all required energy to make, build, and use...

I know Johnny. When you really break down the list it's unbelievable how dependent our society has become on fossil fuels. From the products we buy, to the bags we take them home in; and to both protect crops from pests and bring the food to our doors.

#34: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:09 pm

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

#35: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:09 pm

Daryl Lawes wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

fossil fuels are used by the overusage of vehicles, home heating, use of appliances and an overconsumption of water

Hi Tina !
overconsumption of water?

Ah i figured i would get questioned on this, all the movement of water (between our tap and treatment plants) requires energy. The less water you use, the less need for energy to pump, treat and distribute. Heating water also requires energy!

#36: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:10 pm

Sawdust actually, Jodi, but I digress...

#37: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:10 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

yes, and don't forget the edible oil products like our favorite milkshakes....i hope tim hortons ice caps are oil free.....

#38: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:11 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

Yeah well I heard their Big Macs were made from beef.....Phffftttt

#39: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:11 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Where we use fossil fuel: directly through natural gas to heat our homes, gasoline / diesel in our vehicles, plastics in so many of the packaging and products in our houses, plus all of the wonderful petroleum-based clothing we wear like fleece, polypropylene, etc....then indirectly I guess we could stretch it and say that fossil fuel is used in pesticide manufacturing, fuelling farm machinery, manufacturing fertilizers, etc. so that ultimately fossil fuels are used throughout all aspects of our society. Am I a "guest" today? (Brian Grasser).

Your still a guest Brian.

#40: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:11 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

Jodi... I think alot of food products are based on hydrocarbons. A girl in the office keeps telling me the little jellies (gummy bears, etc) are petroleum based.

Greetings all...Adrian

#41: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:11 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

I was also told that Cheese Whiz is a molecule away from being petroleum. As well those preserved cherries contain benzene..mmm oh I mean...hmmm:)

#42: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:11 pm

Mmmm... Edible oil products. Now I'm starting to think about cookies :)

ewaterman wrote:

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum


yes, and don't forget the edible oil products like our favorite milkshakes....i hope tim hortons ice caps are oil free.....

#43: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:12 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Someone touched on the other major one- food in the form of transport and fertilizer. Fertilizer is actually one of the biggest, next to transport and energy. PS. If you are on as guest identify each post with initials.

Interesting.... fertilizer eh? I did not know. Another reason not to live in Manitoba.....?

#44: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:12 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Someone touched on the other major one- food in the form of transport and fertilizer. Fertilizer is actually one of the biggest, next to transport and energy. PS. If you are on as guest identify each post with initials.

Are you referring to the manufacturing of fertilizers?

#45: Author: Jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:12 pm

I haven't had one in years...but I remember they were always nice and thick and frothy - I'm sure it wasn't a real food additive that made them that way. Edible oil is a good one - have you ever been given a creamer in a restaurant that says right on it "edible oil product"...yummy.

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

#46: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:12 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Someone touched on the other major one- food in the form of transport and fertilizer. Fertilizer is actually one of the biggest, next to transport and energy. PS. If you are on as guest identify each post with initials.

of course, i forgot about that one, man just think what our soils are really full of. yuck. i'm surprised our ecosystems still function, or do they?

#47: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:13 pm

in regards to the transport of food, i came across an interesting stat---our average meal travels about 2500 kilometers before it reaches our plate--thats alot of fuel

#48: Author: Thien Tran,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:13 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

I think they could probably be the ester synthesis in organic chemistry. These esters would give the flavors

#49: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:13 pm

No stats tonight johnny.....

Johnny wrote:

Mmmm... Edible oil products. Now I'm starting to think about cookies :)

ewaterman wrote:

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

yes, and don't forget the edible oil products like our favorite milkshakes....i hope tim hortons ice caps are oil free.....

#50: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:13 pm

Now 'spray cheese' must be made with petroleum too.

#51: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:13 pm

jlasuik wrote:

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

I was also told that Cheese Whiz is a molecule away from being petroleum. As well those preserved cherries contain benzene..mmm oh I mean...hmmm:)

I heard the same thing about margarine.

#52: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:13 pm

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. What are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

#53: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:14 pm

Check out the Cool Whip label

Dawn wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

I was also told that Cheese Whiz is a molecule away from being petroleum. As well those preserved cherries contain benzene..mmm oh I mean...hmmm:)

I heard the same thing about margarine.

#54: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:15 pm

Not to mention the transport of fishmeal and animal feeds to grow our cows, pigs and fish.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

in regards to the transport of food, i came across an interesting stat---our average meal travels about 2500 kilometers before it reaches our plate--thats alot of fuel

#55: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:15 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

well one good point about using fossil fuels that we all probably wont protest is they have kept us in the life we have been acustomed to

#56: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:15 pm

Perhaps this is a stupid question, but how are fossil fuels used in fertilizers? Are they not a source of environmental damage because they are not being burned and releasing the carbon to the atmosphere. Sorry for the ignorance here, but I am interested in the answers. Thanks.

#57: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:16 pm

Well, in terms of products like plastics and fleece clothing, and advantage is obviously the longevity of the product. THis "may" not be so bad if we were able to effectively recycle them at the end of their lives;

however, as we all know, they often end up in ditches or landfills.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

#58: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:16 pm

Hi Erin

I guess its Magic!

ewaterman wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Someone touched on the other major one- food in the form of transport and fertilizer. Fertilizer is actually one of the biggest, next to transport and energy. PS. If you are on as guest identify each post with initials.

of course, i forgot about that one, man just think what our soils are really full of. yuck. i'm surprised our ecosystems still function, or do they?

#59: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:17 pm

Fuels give us the benefit of life as we know it. Like we've read it is not the actual fuel we want its the product or service we get by using them. Warm house, transportation, food in the winter.

#60: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:17 pm

Our dependance on fossil fuels are a definite advantage for the fossil fuel industries. And the local economies in areas with these reserves tend to benefit too. At least with alot growth and job creation. The environmental degradation that comes with it kind of counter acts that.

#61: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:17 pm

ewaterman wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

well one good point about using fossil fuels that we all probably wont protest is they have kept us in the life we have been acustomed to

Each step along the path creates jobs and money for someone.

#62: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:17 pm

Jalcockwhite wrote:

I haven't had one in years...but I remember they were always nice and thick and frothy - I'm sure it wasn't a real food additive that made them that way. Edible oil is a good one - have you ever been given a creamer in a restaurant that says right on it "edible oil product"...yummy.


jodi jane friesen wrote:

Someone told me McDonalds milkshakes are made with petroleum

Edible oil products aren't just tasty, but if you are every stranded out in the bush, they make a great fire starter!

For a fun experiment at home, light up some Coffee Mate!

Kevin

#63: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:18 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

One advantage I can think of is a known recipe. Any old plastic factory can make plastic so find someone to stick some electronics in it, put a fancy label on it and call it a MP3 player. Or a toy gun from the dollar store, or packaging.....you get my point.

#64: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:18 pm

Besides all the goods and different chemical combinations that create all these products. For me the readings brought home the idea of how this fuel source is relatively light and easy to carry in transport. Meaning the amount of energy provided per weight is spectacular. Making it practice to fill up a tank and be on our way.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

#65: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:18 pm

If I am not mistaken I think worldwide we use fossil fuel for about 85% of our activities.

Johnny wrote:

Fossil fuels are used pretty much everywhere. They are used to make roads, plastics, energy for every thing I am using right now, my house is made from materials and filled with things that all required energy to make, build, and use...

#66: Author: ssamborsky,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:18 pm

Obviously, having a stored, ready to use source of energy than has to be pumped out of the ground as if it was in tanks is of tremendous benefit. The alternative (this applies to many new technologies) is harvesting energy in it's less dense forms like wind and solar adds another step to the process which, in the case of FFs is done for free by mother nature. I think a good trick would be to find another way for nature to do this work for us.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

#67: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:18 pm

It means that with such a developed network of infrastructure and dependent technologies built around fossil fuels, it would take an incredible amount of restructuring to change this dependence.

This certainly gives an advantage to the suppliers of fossil fuels in the ability to make money...however, it might mean that if a very similar alternative exists that is not fossil fuel based then it could be a viable substitute using the same infrastructure and networks, like biofuels/biomass

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

#68: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:18 pm

The bad points are obviously the environmental impacts associated with burning fossil fuels and the good points are that they have provided us all with convenience. People are so busy these days that convenience is very important to us.

#69: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:18 pm

Tammy wrote:

Perhaps this is a stupid question, but how are fossil fuels used in fertilizers? Are they not a source of environmental damage because they are not being burned and releasing the carbon to the atmosphere. Sorry for the ignorance here, but I am interested in the answers. Thanks.

Hi Tammy.

Alot of pesticides and fertilizers are fossil fuel based. Check out this website

http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/100303_eating_oil.html

#70: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:19 pm

Amy Wilson wrote:

Fuels give us the benefit of life as we know it. Like we've read it is not the actual fuel we want its the product or service we get by using them. Warm house, transportation, food in the winter.

that is a great answer amy, we all want to be warm and cozy but using these fuels like dawn said give our country a source of economy and all of us in jobs trying to clean up after the industrial movement

#71: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:19 pm

Our food is also produced using fossil fuels.

#72: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:19 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

There are a couple large negative points regarding our dependance, one being the environmental effects of the burning of fossil fuels and secondly the fact that it is a non-renewable resource.

Positives, well, they are an economical fuel source which allows us the conveniences we have become accustomed to. Also fossil fues are a large revenue generator for our country.

#73: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:19 pm

Many pesticides and fertilizers based on nitrogen are extracted from oil, Tammy. Basically oil contains the building blocks of fertilizer. These chemical fertilizers tend to "burn" the soil, killing natural microlife.

#74: Author: Thien Tran,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:20 pm

Repost

one good thing about fossil fuel was it helps us to speed up our modern civilization to the point of rethinking our own actions.

Last edited by Thien Tran on Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:23 pm; edited 1 time in total

#75: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:20 pm

I read a National Geographic article not too long ago, it wasn't directly related to fossil fuels but it touched on how they are valued - in a way different than how our society values FF. The story was in a third world country - african desert. The writer discussed how amazed he was at how carefully people used fuels due to the cost and shortage. It was still sold in glass bottles. He watched people fill their tanks so that every drop went in. Just imagine how much fuel is dribbled onto the ground each day as we civilized people try to fill up in hurry and get on with the rat race.

#76: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:21 pm

This is a throw back to elementary school, but I remember being taught that electricity aka fossil fuels sparked a new century of innovation and invention. The electricity provided individuals to work beyond the daylight hours and really it took provided individuals with opportunities beyond basic survival and farming. So, I guess I am trying to say that fossil fuels have given humans the chance to advance (whether for better or worse) and live a life beyond day to day survival.

#77: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:21 pm

ssamborsky wrote:

Obviously, having a stored, ready to use source of energy than has to be pumped out of the ground as if it was in tanks is of tremendous benefit. The alternative (this applies to many new technologies) is harvesting energy in it's less dense forms like wind and solar adds another step to the process which, in the case of FFs is done for free by mother nature. I think a good trick would be to find another way for nature to do this work for us.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

Great Point Shawn!

a stored, rich, energy source is the best advantage that fossil fuels have.

Good to talk to you by the way !

#78: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:21 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

It means that with such a developed network of infrastructures and dependent technologies built around fossil fuels, it would take an incredible amount of restructuring to change this dependence.

This certainly gives an advantage to the suppliers of fossil fuels in the ability to make money...however, it might mean that if a very similar alternative exists that is not fossil fuel based then it could be a viable substitute using the same infrastructure and networks, like biofuels/biomass

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

Unfortunately the world's reliance on fossil fuels and developed infrastructure makes for an uncompetitive market--it makes it difficult to introduce new technology

#79: Author: Guest, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:22 pm

Thien Tran wrote:

one good thing about fossil fuel was it help us to speed up our modern civilization at the non-stoable point.

I think thats an important point TT. It has given us the chance to become what we have. Unfortunately it has also made us what we are. (Is Grasser here? he might appreciate this!!)

#80: Author: Dawn, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:22 pm

cpiedt wrote:

The bad points are obviously the environmental impacts associated with burning fossil fuels and the good points are that they have provided us all with convenience. People are so busy these days that convenience is very important to us.

But without fossil fuels do you think we would have come up with alternative methods of providing these conveniences? Or at least invested more time and money exploring them. I think the mindset that there is an unlimitedresource with the capacity to meet all of our needs has hampered research and development of alternative technologies.

#81: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:22 pm

Tammy wrote:

This is a throw back to elementary school, but I remember being taught that electicity aka fossil fuels sparked a new century of inovation and invention. The electricity provided individuals to work beyond the daylight hours and really it took provided individuals with opportunities beyond basic survival and farming. So, I guess I am trying to say that fossil fuels have given humans the chance to advance (whether for better or worse) and live a life beyond day to day survival.

great point Tammy

#82: Author: Amy Wilson, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:22 pm

I agree Jodi, one major advantage of fossil fuels is that we've had decades to refine the entire process making it more efficient than the alternatives (though it is not efficient in an environmental sense).

#83: Author: Johnny, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:22 pm


The bad thing is that we artificially speed up one component of geo-chemical cycling, but it cannot be cycled back fast enough, so we end up with excess by-product (heat, pollutants) in our environment. Good thing is that fossil fuels enable us to undertake many activities that enrich our lives.

#84: Author: Ann Dale, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:23 pm

Class, I have an esteemed colleague here from UBC, Rob vanWynsberg, can he join us? If anyone has an objection, please say so, otherwise I will take silence for acceptance.

#85: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:23 pm

I've noticed that the two main things in my recycling bins (and this is true of Canadians in general) are plastics and paper. Given that all of these plastic bags and packaging are petroleum based, it seems rational that finding an alternative material would reduce our oil use. For example, remember from our EMS course that a company had come up with corn-based plastics called polylactides. These "plastic containers" can be composted breaking down within around 40 days and use 20 - 50% less fossil fuels in their production. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0904/p12s02-sten.html>
Brian

#86: Author: kimwright,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:23 pm

some of the bad points would be the negative impact of dependence on one product to make the essences of life - heating, transport, production, food, etc. it is like putting all our eggs in one basket - we rely on it for both ourselves and export.

And of course the environmental impacts which are hard to predict and account for in the present.

Kim.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

#87: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:23 pm

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in categories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

#88: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:25 pm

Dawn wrote:

Our dependence on fossil fuels are a definite advantage for the fossil fuel industries. And the local economies in areas with these reserves tend to benefit too. At least with alot growth and job creation. The environmental degradation that comes with it kind of counter acts that.

Dawn, but don't forget, there is economic growth from reclamation of the environment as well especially related to the extraction of oil and gas from the environment.

I'm not sure if it's my connection or our server, but my refreshing is very slow tonight, wow, it's going to be a

long night.

#89: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:26 pm

There are two categories that individuals can utilize to reduce energy use; technical and behavioural.

The technical includes selecting items that use the least energy to produce or operate. This permeates through every product that we acquire.

The behavioural includes how we use the products; limiting certain activities or substituting energy intensive ones with less intensive ones; or avoiding some activities all together. We can also pester our politicians to do something and take the time to talk to our neighbors about it.

All this assumes, of course, that we are affluent enough to afford alternate choices. If I am very limited in financial resources, I would be forced to select the lowest priced choices, which are usually the most energy-intensive choices (go figure?). Survival takes precedent over energy efficient technology or behaviour.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in categories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

#90: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:26 pm

As an example, if I switch from orange juice to local apple and grape juice, I will cut out a huge bunch of oil per glass, even more if my juice is organic.

#91: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:27 pm

I agree Cathy, fossil fuels may have helped us advance but if we hadn't had them, we would have come up with alternatives. Just imagine, our society could be based on completely sustainable energy sources. I think we have just convinced ourselves that if it weren't for FF that we wouldn't be here today - I'm convinced that we probably would have been better off.

Dawn wrote:

cpiedt wrote:

The bad points are obviously the environmental impacts associated with burning fossil fuels and the good points are that they have provided us all with convenience. People are so busy these days that convenience is very important to us.

But without fossil fuels do you think we would have come up with alternative methods of providing these conveniences? Or at least invested more time and money exploring them. I think the mindset that there is an unlimited resource with the capacity to meet all of our needs has hampered research and development of alternative technologies.

#92: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:27 pm

Johnny wrote:

The bad thing is that we artificially speed up one component of geo-chemical cycling, but it cannot be cycled back fast enough, so we end up with excess by-product (heat, pollutants) in our environment. Good thing is that fossil fuels enable us to undertake many activities that enrich our lives.

You are probably familiar with this Johnny, having lived up North. I have heard many comments from the subsistence harvesters in the Inuvik area about how FF have allowed them to hunt more efficiently than in the past (ski-doo's are a lot faster than dog teams, maybe not as enjoyable). But the down side is that now they have to work the entire year in order to afford the gas/equipment to go out on the land, which now is their holiday.

#93: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:27 pm

Welcome Rob and feel free to jump in

#94: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:28 pm

Hi Monica

Just click the "refresh" button at the top of your page when you want to refresh.

Monica wrote:

Dawn wrote:

Our dependence on fossil fuels are a definite advantage for the fossil fuel industries. And the local economies in areas with these reserves tend to benefit too. At least with alot growth and job creation. The environmental degradation that comes with it kind of counter acts that.

Dawn, but don't forget, there is economic growth from reclamation of the environment as well especially related to the extraction of oil and gas from the environment.

I'm not sure if it's my connection or our server, but my refreshing is very slow tonight, wow, it's going to be a long night.

#95: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:28 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in catagories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

Recycle and use recycled products are a good way.

#96: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:28 pm

We could reduce some fossil fuel use by using reusable grocery bags instead of plastic ones, and glass containers, and refusing to buy Ziploc bags or Saran wrap. And by using refill containers instead of buying and throwing away a whole unch of little ones.

#97: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:28 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in catagories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

My family thought I was crazy at Thanksgiving when I casually mentioned the fact that I though Gas should go upto and beyond \$2 per litre. (of course I'd had a couple of beers at that point and feeling like I should speak my mind)

#98: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:28 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in catagories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

Being aware of where our goods come is a good start. Choose goods that are more local based than ones that travel long distances would help.

#99: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:29 pm

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

#100: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:29 pm

Dawn wrote:

cpiedt wrote:

The bad points are obviously the environmental impacts associated with burning fossil fuels and the good points are that they have provided us all with convenience. People are so busy these days that convenience is very important to us.

But without fossil fuels do you think we would have come up with alternative methods of providing these conveniences? Or at least invested more time and money exploring them. I think the mindset that there is an unlimited resource with the capacity to meet all of our needs has hampered research and development of alternative technologies.

Absolutely. I do think we would have come up with alternative fuels instead if we had to. Just like we are doing now because we are discovering that we have to. But even with alternative fuels that are less environmentally damaging than fossil fuels, I'm sure we will discover negative impacts from them as well, to some degree. We just consume sooooo much, there will be no way to get around that.

#101: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:29 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

As an example, if I switch from orange juice to local apple and grape juice, I will cut out a huge bunch of oil per glass, even more if my juice is organic.

Good example, the simple, do-able choices are the ones i have been trying to stress to my staff when doing environmental awareness training. So many people feel they can't, or can't afford to make a difference, i wish people would recognize that little baby steps are important, add up and do make a difference

#102: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:29 pm

as individuals making our homes more energy efficient is a great way to reduce our use of energy. we are insulating our basement subfloor as we speak (I was cutting "styrofoam insulation just 10 mins before this discussion).

#103: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:29 pm

And don't forget bottled water. In a store here in Vancouver, there was bottled water from Fiji, think about the transportation costs, the plastics, the embedded energy costs. Instead of dealing with our water situation and cleaning up at source, we make a business out of it.

Lenore Newman wrote:

As an example, if I switch from orange juice to local apple and grape juice, I will cut out a huge bunch of oil per glass, even more if my juice is organic.

#104: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:30 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

As an example, if I switch from orange juice to local apple and grape juice, I will cut out a huge bunch of oil per glass, even more if my juice is organic.

maybe we can make a new policy that every product we use or buy has to be labeled with the amount of energy used to make the product from start to finish. when i am consuming i have really no idea if my MEC organic cotton pants take more energy than my fleecy cozy pants. so how do i make a decision of what one to buy if i want new pants with less fossi fuels attached?

#105: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:30 pm

Other than transportation and heating, I think Johnny touched upon the nature of our product consumption. Packaging always bugs me. I think I'd like to see more "bulk" aisles at the supermarkets where we can keep refilling our containers (plastic, glass, etc.) with shampoo, various foods, household liquids (cleaners), etc.
Brian

#106: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:30 pm

Yes Kevin, I have engaged in that discussion several times in the past. Same goes for fishing on the East Coast.

Kevin Bill wrote:

Johnny wrote:

The bad thing is that we artificially speed up one component of geo-chemical cycling, but it cannot be cycled back fast enough, so we end up with excess by-product (heat, pollutants) in our environment. Good thing is that fossil fuels enable us to undertake many activities that enrich our lives.

You are probably familiar with this Johnny, having lived up North. I have heard many comments from the subsistence harvesters in the Inuvik area about how FF have allowed them to hunt more efficiently than in the past (ski-doo's are a lot faster than dog teams, maybe not as enjoyable). But the down side is that now they have to work the entire year in order to afford the gas/equipment to go out on the land, which now is their holiday.

#107: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:30 pm

Good examples people, let's keep "blue skying" for a minute- setting aside the negatives for a bit and let's brainstorm. By the way, re-using can be even better than recycling

#108: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:31 pm

In our first e-Dialogue on climate change, Danny Harvie, from UofT, an economist and climate change expert claims we can reduce ghg emissions by 30% just retrofitting existing buildings no new technology, and 60% by introducing new technology.

Amy Wilson wrote:

as individuals making our homes more energy efficient is a great way to reduce our use of energy. we are insulating our basement subfloor as we speak (I was cutting "styrofoam insulation just 10 mins before this discussion).

#109: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:31 pm

The best way to reduce our fossil fuel dependance is to reduce our consumption in general. If our society wasn't so consumer driven we wouldn't have all these silly items to buy that just put added pressure on our environment. I am sure half if not more of the things I purchase are unnecessary; they are merely a convenience or soemthing that looks pretty. Change how we buy and I think you solve a lot of our

environmental concerns (you just have to find new ways to keep the economy going which is always the trick, isn't it)

#110: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:31 pm

They can support alternative energy sources by buying other products that do not rely solely on fossil fuels, recycle products made from ff (such as bags), check labels and buy food products that don't contain ff or buy foods that are organic. People can also encourage others to change their attitudes towards using fossil fuels and waste.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in categories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

#111: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:31 pm

shawn samborsky wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in categories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

My family thought I was crazy at Thanksgiving when I casually mentioned the fact that I thought Gas should go up to and beyond \$2 per litre. (of course I'd had a couple of beers at that point and feeling like I should speak my mind)

You....beer? I hope it was home brewed. Otherwise the beer company had to haul it along way and burn a pile of FF in the process.

#112: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:32 pm

How about our consumer choices. Picking an good okangan wine over an australian wine... many simple choices can reduce our energy use.

#113: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:32 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in categories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

What about using natural fertilizers. I know that on our corporate farms we have to pay farmers to take our

fertilizer? How much sense does this make.

#114: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:33 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in categories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

I guess one way would be to buy locally grown products as much as possible, whether it be meat, produce, or any other good that we use.

#115: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:33 pm

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficient we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

#116: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:34 pm

Yes, in a capitalist system, economic agency is a necessary and sufficient first condition, and fear and loss of economic livelihood prevents a lot of change, especially when people can't see or know what options there are.

Tammy wrote:

The best way to reduce our fossil fuel dependence is to reduce our consumption in general. If our society wasn't so consumer driven we wouldn't have all these silly items to buy that just put added pressure on our environment. I am sure half if not more of the things I purchase are unnecessary; they are merely a convenience or something that looks pretty. Change how we buy and I think you solve a lot of our environmental concerns (you just have to find new ways to keep the economy going which is always the trick, isn't it)

#117: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:34 pm

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#118: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:34 pm

Erin, you raise a great point- imagine if each product had an energy equivalent on it for us to compare. I try to use cotton and wood whenever possible, but then my Dad is a logger so maybe I am biased.

#119: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:34 pm

I am not sure how, but based upon our early discussion, the reduction of fertilizer seems to be a big area with opportunity. Go organic?, love to.

#120: Author: rvanwyns,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:34 pm

Thank you very much for allowing me to contribute. My name is Rob VanWynsberghe. I am a sociologist who is joining Royal Roads in January. Currently I work in health promotion at the University of British Columbia. I study sustainability, particularly community-based projects. Specific research project explore case studies and cross-case analysis, First Nations and Tobacco Taxation, the Olympic Games and Healthy Communities and Cultural Models. I hope I can contribute.

#121: Author: Thien Tran,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:34 pm

Other than transportation and enegy use!

We can promote clothing made of cotton and go back to eat more fruit and vegetable. In that way we would help agriulture and people will grow more real green products, and they would help CO2 sink too.

#122: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:34 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

In our first e-Dialogue on climate change, Danny Harvie, from UofT, an economist and climate change expert claims we can reduce ghg emissions by 30% just retrofitting existing buildings no new technology, and 60% by introducing new technology.

Amy Wilson wrote:

as individuals making our homes more energy efficient is a great way to reduce our use of energy. we are insulating our basement subfloor as we speak (I was cutting "styrofoam insulation just 10 mins before this discussion).

Air leakage represents between 25% and 40% of the heat loss from an older home, windows can account for up to 25% of total house heat loss. So getting rid of leaks, with weather stripping, new windows or doors, insulation, etc can amount to huge savings

#123: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:35 pm

[quote="Johnny"]Hi Monica

Just click the "refresh" button at the top of your page when you want to refresh.

Monica wrote:

Dawn wrote:

Our dependance on fossil fuels are a definite advantage for the fossil fuel industries. And the local economies in areas with these reserves tend to benefit too. At least with alot growth and job creation. The environmental degradation that comes with it kind of counter acts that.

Dawn, but don't forget, there is economic growth from reclamation of the environment as well especially related to the extraction of oil and gas from the environment.

I'm not sure if it's my connection or our server, but my refreshing is very slow tonight, wow, it's going to be a long night.

[/quote

Good point Monica. And Alberta is an excellent example of the benefits fossil fuel reserves can reap. But do you think the environment is ever really returned to it's natural state. This is off topic, but there's a big mine around here. They want to mine under a lake, so they're planning to drain it, relocate it, mine the area, and then put it back. The idea seems crazy to me, but the mine supports the town. When it comes to a choice between having the means necessary for survival and preserving the environment money wins out.

#124: Author: Adrian Paradis, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:35 pm

jlasnik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficinet we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

No, A couple of local houses have their own. I think, Kevin step in here, that Inuvik has a community greenhouse for growing vegetables.

#125: Author: Johnny, ▣Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:35 pm

Inuit survived just fine without vegetables in their diet (save for the odd berry or root) Seal fat is actually high in content of many of the vitamins found in fruits and veggies. Too bad it now also contains bioaccumulative chemicals.

jlasnik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficinet we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

#126: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:36 pm

Excellent point Jason. I really agree with the idea of living within your local community. You are more likely to respect your own backyard and limit your consumption or think before you buy when you are draining your own lake or dumping in your own home. Back to the idea that you will take care of your own and act responsibly if you feel connected to the cause.

jlasuik wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Well, it was a bit of a trick question. If, as an individual you want to cut fossil fuel use, and you live in a society where most everything is made of fossil fuels, there is a lot of "low hanging fruit", that is we can cut use dramatically by looking at almost any aspect of our lives and figuring out a non fossil alternative. And that is the first message I want to get across today- we can cut use a lot on our own. So what are some ways we can cut our individual use in catagories OTHER than transport or energy use (we have talked about them a bit anyway)

Being aware of where our goods come is a good start. Choose goods that are more local based than ones that travel long distances would help.

#127: Author: ewaterman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:36 pm

thanks for the great discussion everyone. i have to go or i will miss my bus.....yes.....alternative transportation.....loser cruiser all the way!!

#128: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:36 pm

jlasuik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficinet we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

We have a greenhouse in Inuvik where you can grow your own vegetables. I guess the problem is, it is hard to grow a full years supply in a 10ft x 6ft plot

#129: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:37 pm

ewaterman wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

As an example, if I switch from orange juice to local apple and grape juice, I will cut out a huge bunch of oil per glass, even more if my juice is organic.

maybe we can make a new policy that every product we use or buy has to be labeled with the amount of energy used to make the product from start to finish. when i am consuming i have really no idea if my MEC organic cotton pants take more energy than my fleecy cozy pants. so how do i make a decision of what one to buy if i want new pants with less fossi fuels attached?

Wow, what a great idea!

#130: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:37 pm

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

#131: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:38 pm

Welcome :)

rwanwyns wrote:

Thank you very much for allowing me to contribute. My name is Rob VanWynsberghe. I am a sociologist who is joining Royal Roads in January. Currently I work in health promotion at the University of British Columbia. I study sustainability, particularly community-based projects. Specific research project explore case studies and cross-case analysis, First Nations and Tobacco Taxation, the Olympic Games and Healthy Communities and Cultural Models. I hope I can contribute.

#132: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:38 pm

How about government investment in biofuels?

#133: Author: Daryl Lawes,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:39 pm

My brother is now the policy guy in the BC gov't for a whole series of recyclables. I think he has bottles, bags, batteries, and tires or something like that. I will work on hime every family gathering to move things up a notch.

for tires - we can send them to Barry for his fireplace.

#134: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:39 pm

Does it use grow lights and heat for the cold months?

Kevin Bill wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficient we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

We have a greenhouse in Inuvik where you can grow your own vegetables. I guess the problem is, it is hard to grow a full years supply in a 10ft x 6ft plot

#135: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:39 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

I cannot see many families with children willing to spend more money for home basics. No Politician gets re-elected promising to raise taxes or prices.

#136: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:40 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Other than transportation and heating, I think Johnny touched upon the nature of our product consumption. Packaging always bugs me. I think I'd like to see more "bulk" aisles at the supermarkets where we can keep refilling our containers (plastic, glass, etc.) with shampoo, various foods, household liquids (cleaners), etc.
Brian

No kidding. I don't understand the need for having to rip away a layer of plastic, then a layer of cardboard and one more of plastic to get to the product. I don't know what goes on in some people's minds.

#137: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:40 pm

But then there are still the emissions associated with recycling. Even if you don't drive to drop things off, they're usually transported from the depot to the recycling facility. Around here that tends to be a significant distance. Then there are the emissions directly associated with the recycling process, to manufacture new items, and to transport them back to the market.

jalcockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#138: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:40 pm

I agree a new wave is needed. I constantly wonder about what is being recycled when it heads off in the blue box. I for one would like to investigate this more.

jalcockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#139: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:40 pm

Lenore, interesting point, I think a movement is happening, Charles Krauthamer from the Washington Post, a conservative journal wrote after Hurricane Katrina that Americans quickly absorbed the price increase in oil, and he stated oil should reflect its true cost, and the taxes generated go into more sustainable energy sources.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

#140: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:40 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

How about government investment in biofuels?

How about government investment in anything other than fossil fuels.
The word on the street is that the Mackenzie Gas Project will be 'invested' in by the Government of Canada (smells like a subsidy to me).

#141: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:41 pm

Jane, I think you are hitting on a good point here that as we learned in environmental economics we need to address the true environmental cost of an item and have this accounted for in the price tag. Then maybe fossil fuels wouldn't seem so "wonderful" and we would move towards other options and reducing consumption in a less resistant fashion.

jalcockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#142: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:42 pm

Kevin, great point, imagine if the Federal Government said they would be securing energy futures and diversification by investing in only other than fossil fuels.

Kevin Bill wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about government investment in biofuels?

How about government investment in anything other than fossil fuels.

The word on the street is that the Mackenzie Gas Project will be 'invested' in by the Government of Canada (smells like a subsidy to me).

#143: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:42 pm

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

#144: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:42 pm

Biofuels can mean a lot of things, cutting trees for firewood, for example. Do you have a specific one in mind?

Ann Dale wrote:

How about government investment in biofuels?

#145: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:42 pm

I don't think the general public would go for this idea. We've talked about the rat race and how people rely on FF to fuel their busy lives. How could we convince someone that they have to work as hard but for less, just to reduce FF use and save the environment?

Some people may see this as a positive way to preserve the world for future generations. Others may see it as hampering their quest for power and a bigger car.

Again, we are in a gray area. It feels like people are being forced to take the less and give away more. How can we make these alternatives seem desirable?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

#146: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:42 pm

I think a big thing would be moving towards design for disassembly, composting, recycling...generally a zero waste society. And like Jane alluded to, just a generally more simple, less materialistic and energy-intensive way of living. Brian

#147: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:42 pm

Did you know that something as simple as ensuring proper air pressure in your vehicles tires can reduce your annual GHGs by at least one eighth of a tonne and save at least \$50 in fuel costs--AHH the simple things

#148: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:43 pm

I like that idea too Brian. It would reduce the waste of throwing out a bunch of little containers, the emissions associated with manufacturing the containers, and transportation of the products as the large bulk containers probably wouldn't require as many trips as their smaller and more numerous counterparts.

cpiedt wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Other than transportation and heating, I think Johnny touched upon the nature of our product consumption. Packaging always bugs me. I think I'd like to see more "bulk" aisles at the supermarkets where we can keep refilling our containers (plastic, glass, etc.) with shampoo, various foods, household liquids (cleaners), etc.
Brian

No kidding. I don't understand the need for having to rip away a layer of plastic, then a layer of cardboard and one more of plastic to get to the product. I don't know what goes on in some people's minds.

#149: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:43 pm

What about the other two R's Reduce and Reuse. We seem to stress more the recycling aspect. Is this because there is a business to promote this and people making money - therefore recycling has taken off?

Dawn wrote:


But then there are still the emissions associated with recycling. Even if you don't drive to drop things off, they're usually transported from the depot to the recycling facility. Around here that tends to be a significant distance. Then there are the emissions directly associated with the recycling process, to manufacture new items, and to transport them back to the market.

jalcockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#150: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:43 pm

Johnny wrote:

Does it use grow lights and heat for the cold months?

Kevin Bill wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficient we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

We have a greenhouse in Inuvik where you can grow your own vegetables. I guess the problem is, it is hard to grow a full years supply in a 10ft x 6ft plot

The greenhouse is only open in the summer months, so no lights and little power are required. If you start some of the plants earlier in the year at home, you can get two growing seasons.

#151: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:43 pm

Kevin Bill wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about government investment in biofuels?

How about government investment in anything other than fossil fuels.

The word on the street is that the Mackenzie Gas Project will be 'invested' in by the Government of Canada (smells like a subsidy to me).

That ain't happening. The government is going to reduce taxes/royalties and back the APG for their loans. The MPG doesn't want Canada to be a partner in the building.

#152: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:43 pm


Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

My quick and likely very unpopular answer. No.

#153: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:44 pm

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

#154: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:44 pm

Careful here, the 1970s Conserver Society Project (you will see it all written there what we are talking about) failed because people would not accept doing more with less, and my parents generation associated the project with the Depression. We need to make it sexy, make it fun and make people want to do right and feel good. How?

jalcockwhite wrote:

I don't think the general public would go for this idea. We've talked about the rat race and how people rely on FF to fuel their busy lives. How could we convince someone that they have to work as hard but for less, just to reduce FF use and save the environment? Some people may see this as a positive way to preserve the world for future generations. Others may see it as hampering their quest for power and a bigger car. Again, we are in a gray area. It feels like people are being forced to take the less and give away more. How can we make these alternatives seem desirable?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

#155: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:45 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

I knew someone would bring Economics into it. Is Charles online here or what? It comes down to willingness to pay. Yes, I am willing to pay slightly more for certain things. I too am doing some extra insulating projects, and buying CF lightbulbs but I can only afford to be so green. I switched to a more efficient car for daily commute but my big V8 4x4 is parked in the garage for my weekend trips to the woods or fun in the snow.

#156: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:45 pm

I myself am willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil, however, for the public in general I think it depends on how much money they can afford to spend. As someone put it already, survival is most important. Many people can't afford alternative choices, such as the more expensive organic products. There are though alternatives that perhaps just people need to be aware of. Some communities such as Hazelton have First Nation initiatives for villages supplying local grown food baskets at low costs to educate and promote community health, and cut back on that for transport use.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

#157: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:45 pm

I am willing and I think a reasonable amount of society (in developed nations) are willing to pay more.

I think government should subsidize biofuels (and other alternatives) since they do it for the fossil fuel industry. I thought the point of subsidies was to help industries out until they become self sufficient?

The BC goven is going to start subsidizing wind power, by not charging rent for turbines on crown land - for specified period.

#158: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:45 pm

I think a lot of people think that they need to make major changes to make a real difference. I think more awareness of little things will help build momentum.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Did you know that something as simple as ensuring proper air pressure in your vehicles tires can reduce your annual GHGs by at least one eighth of a tonne and save at least \$50 in fuel costs--AHH the simple things

#159: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:46 pm

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Kevin Bill wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about government investment in biofuels?

How about government investment in anything other than fossil fuels.

The word on the street is that the Mackenzie Gas Project will be 'invested' in by the Government of Canada (smells like a subsidy to me).

That ain't happening. The government is going to reduce taxes/royalties and back the APG for their loans. The MPG doesn't want Canada to be a partner in the building.

Sorry Kevin. I misunderstood what was posted. The Government is 'subsidizing' the project with a better tax system. Have you seen the announcement today if the JRP is going ahead?

#160: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:47 pm

Recycling is popular because it is difficult to find a reuse for a lot of things and even when we set out to reduce, the choices just aren't there. Therefore, we end up with a lot of 'junk' that we're glad to have taken off our hands, and we feel good because it is gone to be recycled into some other useless item.

jlasnik wrote:

What about the other two R's Reduce and Reuse. We seem to stress more the recycling aspect. Is this because there is a business to promote this and people making money - therefore recycling has taken off?

Dawn wrote:

But then there are still the emissions associated with recycling. Even if you don't drive to drop things off, they're usually transported from the depot to the recycling facility. Around here that tends to be a significant distance. Then there are the emissions directly associated with the recycling process, to manufacture new items, and to transport them back to the market.

jalcockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#161: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:47 pm

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Did you know that something as simple as ensuring proper air pressure in your vehicles tires can reduce your annual GHGs by at least one eighth of a tonne and save at least \$50 in fuel costs--AHH the simple things

Tina, you have a lot of interesting stats. I recently attended a group of workshops put on by Natural Resources Canada, and I learned a lot of "spot the savings" idea like the ones you have mentioned.

#162: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:47 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#163: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:47 pm

Tammy and Jane:

Not to be pessimistic but as far as the change in mindset goes I think there will need to be a bit of shock therapy to society in terms of expense and availability of energy. These are the things that seem to affect change. Trying to convince the public that the environmental issue is important while security, the economy, healthcare and the dozens of other issues that they are confronted are important as well.

#164: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:48 pm

Ann and Monica have a point. Doing less is only ok if people don't notice they have less. The trick is somehow making these little changes seem exciting and appealing.

#165: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:48 pm

I guess if it did it would use energy , but electricity rather than FF. Maybe even solar or wind rather than electricity.

Johnny wrote:

Does it use grow lights and heat for the cold months?

Kevin Bill wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficinet we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

We have a greenhouse in Inuvik where you can grow your own vegetables. I guess the problem is, it is hard to grow a full years supply in a 10ft x 6ft plot

#166: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:48 pm


I don't think the general public is really willing to pay more to reduce fossil fuel use. Money is a powerful influence. Just look at all the small local businesses that close due to the pressure of big chains. People aren't willing to pay more to support these places even though they typically provide greater direct benefits to the local economy. Likewise, I don't think they're willing to pay alot more to preserve the environment. Not unless there was a fundamental shift in societal values. If society looked down on the individuals who drove to work and left the lights on people might now be as inclined to do it.

jalcockwhite wrote:

I don't think the general public would go for this idea. We've talked about the rat race and how people rely on FF to fuel their busy lives. How could we convince someone that they have to work as hard but for less, just to reduce FF use and save the environment? Some people may see this as a positive way to preserve the world for future generations. Others may see it as hampering their quest for power and a bigger car. Again, we are in a gray area. It feels like people are being forced to take the less and give away more. How can we make these alternatives seem desirable?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

#167: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:48 pm

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Kevin Bill wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

How about government investment in biofuels?

How about government investment in anything other than fossil fuels.
The word on the street is that the Mackenzie Gas Project will be 'invested' in by the Government of Canada (smells like a subsidy to me).

That ain't happening. The government is going to reduce taxes/royalties and back the APG for their loans. The MPG doesn't want Canada to be a partner in the building.

Didn't see the announcement, but heard some stuff through the rumour mill. Looks like I'd better get to work on my Committee's intervention!!

Sorry Kevin. I misunderstood what was posted. The Government is 'subsidizing' the project with a better tax system. Have you seen the announcement today if the JRP is going ahead?

#168: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:49 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

I don't think the general public is getting the message and will remain complacent until it hits where it hurts, the pocket book, or having to do without. On my drive home from work tonight I passed by a couple of houses that were fully decorated for Christmas ... its not even December. A portion of our electricity comes from oil-fired burners; I enjoy the Christmas season when it comes around, but this is going to far. Try explaining to these people that they are adding to global warming.

#169: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:49 pm

If stores were supplied with more bulk products and reuseable containers rather than plastic bags, people would use them. The only issue would then be: where do they go afterwards?

#170: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:50 pm

It seems I am having Faron's problem and I have been showing up as guest. It Meghan by the way. Recycling is great but I know even in my community the things one can recycle is quite limited. It seems great when you purchase things with the little recycle symbol, but it doesnt do much good if you still end up throwing it in the trash.

Johnny wrote:

Recycling is popular because it is difficult to find a reuse for a lot of things and even when we set out to reduce, the choices just aren't there. Therefore, we end up with a lot of 'junk' that we're glad to have taken off our hands, and we feel good because it is gone to be recycled into some other useless item.

jlasuik wrote:

What about the other two R's Reduce and Reuse. We seem to stress more the recycling aspect. Is this because there is a business to promote this and people making money - therefore recycling has taken off?

Dawn wrote:

But then there are still the emissions associated with recycling. Even if you don't drive to drop things off, they're usually transported from the depot to the recycling facility. Around here that tends to be a significant distance. Then there are the emissions directly associated with the recycling process, to manufacture new items, and to transport them back to the market.

jalcockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#171: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:50 pm

I quite agree with you, when you go into organic food stores in Victoria and one chicken breast costs \$7.00. Do we want to create an elite food source, or would buying locally, in season and often organic induce more change than just buying organic? Business is business, there are still 7 different types of organic shampoos in these stores, do we need that, do we even want that?

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I myself am willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil, however, for the public in general I think it depends on how much money they can afford to spend. As someone put it already, survival is most important. Many people can't afford alternative choices, such as the more expensive organic products. There are though alternatives that perhaps just people need to be aware of. Some communities such as Hazelton have First Nation initiatives for villages supplying local grown food baskets at low costs to educate and promote community health, and cut back on that off transport use.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

Last edited by Ann Dale on Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:50 pm; edited 1 time in total

#172: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:50 pm

Electricity created by diesel generators. Or is the power station fully turned to Natural Gas with the little pipeline in town? Kevin?

jlasuik wrote:

I guess if it did it would use energy , but electricity rather than FF. Maybe even solar or wind rather than electricity.

Johnny wrote:

Does it use grow lights and heat for the cold months?

Kevin Bill wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficinet we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

We have a greenhouse in Inuvik where you can grow your own vegetables. I guess the problem is, it is hard to grow a full years supply in a 10ft x 6ft plot

#173: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:51 pm

Monica wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Did you know that something as simple as ensuring proper air pressure in your vehicles tires can reduce your annual GHGs by at least one eighth of a tonne adn save at least \$50 in fuel costs--AHH the simple things

Tina, you have a lot of interesting stats. I recently attended a group of workshops put on by Natural Resources Canada, and I learned a lot of "spot the savings" idea like the ones you have mentioned.

yah, our department is pushing the one-tonne challenge so i have learnt alot through the gov't of canada hand guide. I just find that people think the solution to the problem is too big to handle, but as mentioned small steps are a great start. So many of our employees come from northern communities that don't have recycling depots, etc so they feel they can't contribute. So we are stressing the other R's like reducing and reusing

#174: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:51 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

Packaging does prevent a pretty good sneeze barrier. Take a look sometime in the grocery aisle of a big supermarket how many little sticky fingers picking through the bulk items....candy, etc. I buy spices in bulk but thats about it. Shampoo or cooking oil as Brian mentioned, not bad idea but I think the marketing people would complain if their latest, greatest shampoo with some rare plant as an additive for extra shine was simply dumped into a big ACME shampoo bucket. Like the stuff Willie Coyote always uses!

#175: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:51 pm

How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#176: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:52 pm

So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profit made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less mola.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

#177: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:52 pm

I think the government should shift the subsidies from ff to biofuels. It can be cost -competitive with cas and allow canada to invest energy dollars nationally. One quote from National Resource Defense Council, 2004. Growing Energy, How Biofuels Can Help End America's Oil Dependence. Site accessed November 14, 2005. <http://www.nrdc.org/air/energy/biofuels/biofuels.pdf> says that in the US alone crops to make fuels could provide farmers with profits of more than \$5 Billion per year. The ff infrastructure can also be a base for the biofuel industry as well. Heres where we can use all that Mcdonalds french fry oil!

National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Learning About Renewable Energy and Efficiency. Site accessed November 15, 2005. <http://www.nrel.gov/learning> says

Johnny wrote:

Biofuels can mean a lot of things, cutting trees for firewood, for example. Do you have a specific one in mind?

Ann Dale wrote:

How about government investment in biofuels?

#178: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:52 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

Very good point Brian, and being in the food industry, most of our R&D is currently going into shelf life and packaging is definitely a large part of this. Now, we have to remember that this is consumer driven.

#179: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:53 pm

How to make conservation sexy?

Well, I think we are actually doing that with the younger generation (but not enough with the current generation). I think the new trend in jobs is environmental technicians. The school system has fully integrated environmental issues into the curriculum and it seems to be spewing out budding environmentalists. A lot of at home behaviors are changed because the kids pressure the parents to act. So, in some ways we are making progress.

#180: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:53 pm

How to make conservation sexy?

Well, I think we are actually doing that with the younger generation (but not enough with the current generation). I think the new trend in jobs is environmental technicians. The school system has fully integrated environmental issues into the curriculum and it seems to be spewing out budding environmentalists. A lot of at home behaviors are changed because the kids pressure the parents to act. So, in some ways we are making progress.

#181: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:55 pm

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Electricity created by diesel generators. Or is the power station fully turned to Natural Gas with the little pipeline in town? Kevin?

jlasuik wrote:

I guess if it did it would use energy , but electricity rather than FF. Maybe even solar or wind rather than electricity.

Johnny wrote:

Does it use grow lights and heat for the cold months?

Kevin Bill wrote:

jlasuik wrote:

Adrian Paradis wrote:

Reducing your intake of foreign foods as Lenore mentioned works. But, many in Canada are not close to local markets and have this alternative.

This makes me think that if we were more self-sufficinet we would be able to lessen our dependence on goods that travel long distances. Adrian do they have green houses that allow individuals to obtain garden plots up there?

We have a greenhouse in Inuvik where you can grow your own vegetables. I guess the problem is, it is hard to grow a full years supply in a 10ft x 6ft plot

The town power generator is now changed over to natural gas. Gas is now available for home heating as well, but can cost alot. We just switched over the furnace in our house, for \$2500, so I guess I was willing-to-pay, but many people aren't

#182: Author: jalcockwhite, 📅 Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:55 pm

I agree with you completely. Shock therapy is a must. It is easy to turn a blind eye to something that you can make go "away". Whereas impacts to health and education hit home.

I can't even convince people at my work to stop getting the plastic covering put over their uniforms after dry cleaning. It's not like they are going to get dirty from hanging in their office. I called the company and they had no idea what to do with the plastic - even though it is stamped with recycle symbol. So much for a producer having a plan. You should check out the website (ALSCO), they talk about environmentalism but don't even understand basic concepts - at least over the phone.

shawn samborsky wrote:

Tammy and Jane:

Not to be pessimistic but as far as the change in mindset goes I think there will need to be a bit of shock therapy to society in terms of expense and availability of energy. These are the things that seem to affect change. Trying to convince the public that the environmental issue is important while security, the economy, healthcare and the dozens of other issues that they are confronted are important as well.

#183: Author: Tina Hessdorfer, 📅 Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:55 pm

jlasuik wrote:

So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profit made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less mola.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

The individual doesn't make money, but they will save in the long run, by purchasing less goods

#184: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:56 pm

I totally agree, yesterday I broke my nails, hurt my teeth and nearly pulled a muscle getting into a stupid plastic package. I hear its also for anti theft making the packages so rediculusly large. I cant think of what to do other than write the company and complain and get all your friends to do it too.

cpiedt wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Other than transportation and heating, I think Johnny touched upon the nature of our product consumption. Packaging always bugs me. I think I'd like to see more "bulk" aisles at the supermarkets where we can keep refilling our containers (plastic, glass, etc.) with shampoo, various foods, household liquids (cleaners), etc.
Brian

No kidding. I don't understand the need for having to rip away a layer of plastic, then a layer of cardboard and one more of plastic to get to the product. I don't know what goes on in some people's minds.

#185: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:57 pm

Tammy wrote:

How to make conservation sexy?

Well, I think we are actually doing that with the younger generation (but not enough with the current generation). I think the new trend in jobs is environmental technicians. The school system has fully integrated environmental issues into the curriculum and is seems to be spewing out budding environmentalists. A lot of at home behaviors are changed because the kids pressure the parents to act. So, in some ways we are making progress.

Celebrity endorsements and reality tv shows????

#186: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:57 pm

I think we really need to live more simply, and take the little extra time it may take to use reusable grocery bags, or not use disposable containers for you lunch. We need to back away from using things just because they are more convenient. For example, sure cleaning to tiolet isnt the most glamourous job but do we really need disposable Lysol toilet brusshes and Swiffer Dusters???

jlasuik wrote:

So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profit made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less mola.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

#187: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:57 pm

jlasuik wrote:

So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profit made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less mola.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

Might be a policy question eh Jason? I say tradeable permits (that was my answer for everything). Kidding!
 Actually a sin tax type system for non-reusables might be as close as we get

#188: Author: Andrew Marshall,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:57 pm

I agree that reducing and reusing aspects have been forgotten or pushed to the side. I think that companies should refocus their efforts on these aspects when designing new products. Incentives should be established to generate innovative engineered products that have more than one use. Hey Kramer did it with his 2-in-1 design of a coffee table book that also could be used as an actual coffee table.

jlasuik wrote:

What about the other two R's Reduce and Reuse. We seem to stress more the recycling aspect. Is this because there is a business to promote this and people making money - therefore recycling has taken off?

Dawn wrote:

But then there are still the emissions associated with recycling. Even if you don't drive to drop things off, they're usually transported from the depot to the recycling facility. Around here that tends to be a significant distance. Then there are the emissions directly associated with the recycling process, to manufacture new items, and to transport them back to the market.

jacockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

#189: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:57 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

Careful here, the 1970s Conserver Society Project (you will see it all written there what we are talking about) failed because people would not accept doing more with less, and my parents generation associated the project with the Depression. We need to make it sexy, make it fun and make people want to do right and feel good. How?

jalcockwhite wrote:

I don't think the general public would go for this idea. We've talked about the rat race and how people rely on FF to fuel their busy lives. How could we convince someone that they have to work as hard but for less, just to reduce FF use and save the environment?

Some people may see this as a positive way to preserve the world for future generations. Others may see it as hampering their quest for power and a bigger car.

Again, we are in a gray area. It feels like people are being forced to take the less and give away more. How can we make these alternatives seem desirable?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

Personally, I don't want a lot of stuff, because it would just sit around my house and get dusty, making me look dirty (I don't dust). I don't want big house because I would have to spend my time cleaning it and I would rather have time to do other stuff. My current place is 800 some square feet and I love it. It's clean from top to bottom in about ½ and hour. Great for when my mother in law decides to give me a surprise visit. I think people need to realize that they would have more time if they go back to a simple life. Don't we all want more time?

#190: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:57 pm

jalcockwhite wrote:

How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

Good point Jane. For many items the packaging seems unnecessary. It's also interesting that one reason for extra packaging is to "size-up" certain goods that are targetted by shoplifters. More packaging makes it harder to hide under a coat. They also need something to attach alarm sensors to. But generally, there's simply too much packaging on things.

#191: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:57 pm

jlauik wrote:


So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profit made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less mola.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

Might be a policy question eh Jason? I say tradeable permits (that was my answer for everything). Kidding!

Actually a sin tax type system for non-reusables might be as close as we get

#192: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:58 pm

I just made a bag of microwave popcorn. I feel so guilty. The kernels are in a paper bag (soaked in edible oil product), over-wrapped with a plastic bag, and in a box. The energy to pop the stuff just emitted about 30 grams of CO2. Sigh :(

jalcockwhite wrote:

How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#193: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:59 pm

That was me (Brian) who made the packaging for anti-theft comments. This "guest" ID situation can be a challenge.

#194: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:59 pm

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

#195: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:59 pm

Andrew Marshall wrote:

I agree that reducing and reusing aspects have been forgotten or pushed to the side. I think that companies should refocus their efforts on these aspects when designing new products. Incentives should be established to generate innovative engineered products that have more than one use. Hey Kramer did it with his 2-in-1 design of a coffee table book that also could be used as an actual coffee table.

jlaski wrote:

What about the other two R's Reduce and Reuse. We seem to stress more the recycling aspect. Is this because there is a business to promote this and people making money - therefore recycling has taken off?

Dawn wrote:

But then there are still the emissions associated with recycling. Even if you don't drive to drop things off, they're usually transported from the depot to the recycling facility. Around here that tends to be a significant distance. Then there are the emissions directly associated with the recycling process, to manufacture new items, and to transport them back to the market.

jacockwhite wrote:

I generally re-use everything as much as possible and frequent the recycling depot. I do buy ziploc bags but I wash them out and use them until they are stained and start gathering comments.

But Johnny is right, it's expensive to buy all the eco-friendly products. I'd love to eat everything organic and supply by plastic container cupboard with corn-based products (but I'm sure they're expensive).

I think we need to introduce a new wave of recycling programs - people seem to be getting complacent again.

But Kramer failed in his attempt to make a profit by trucking bottles and cans to Wisconsin for a 10c refund instead of 5c in New York.

#196: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:59 pm

Meghan King wrote:

I think we really need to live more simply, and take the little extra time it may take to use reusable grocery bags, or not use disposable containers for your lunch. We need to back away from using things just because they are more convenient. For example, sure cleaning a toilet isn't the most glamorous job but do we really need disposable Lysol toilet brushes and Swiffer Dusters???

jlaski wrote:

So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profits made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less money.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

In light of the viruses that will soon be taking over the world Meghan I think we do. Again, it's a question of priorities.

#197: Author: jacockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 4:59 pm

Celebrity status does make a difference. Just think about Daryl Hannah and her biofuel car. People like that attract attention and make others want the same things.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Tammy wrote:

How to make conservation sexy?

Well, I think we are actually doing that with the younger generation (but not enough with the current generation). I think the new trend in jobs is environmental technicians. The school system has fully integrated environmental issues into the curriculum and it seems to be spewing out budding environmentalists. A lot of at home behaviors are changed because the kids pressure the parents to act. So, in some ways we are making progress.

Celebrity endorsements and reality tv shows????

#198: Author: Thien Tran,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:00 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

I agree with you Brian that it seems I never finish up a 4oz of whether shampoo or other refillable items because once you open the containers, the shampoo would get oxidized and it does not look or smell as good as it first open. May be go with a smaller size of refillable items. Is it worth it to buy an item only have enough to refill twice?

#199: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:00 pm

Hi reuse my plastic bags for pooper scoopers when walking my dog. I wonder how much energy goes into maintaining that guy?

Meghan King wrote:

I think we really need to live more simply, and take the little extra time it may take to use reusable grocery bags, or not use disposable containers for you lunch. We need to back away from using things just because they are more convenient. For example, sure cleaning to toilet isnt the most glamorous job but do we really need disposable Lysol toilet brushshes and Swiffer Dusters???

jlasuik wrote:

So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profit made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less mola.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

#200: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:00 pm

I think the barriers with bulk is the lack of marketing with it. Let's all admit, the peanut butter in the bulk pail does not as appetizing as the jar shaped like a teddy bear. Not to mention the hygiene issue that Barry has already brought up.

Now, as a parent, we all know how absolutely ridiculous the packaging of toys is, and as I was questioning it for the thousandth time why every little piece has to be tied down to the cardboard, I realized that it all about the presentation in the box, so again, it goes back to marketing.

#201: Author: shawn samborsky,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:01 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

If not for JFKs golf clubs the venture would have been a sucess

#202: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:01 pm

One could advertize alternatives as fresh, neuvous, sexy, healthy and really downplay the use of fossil fuels, make it ugly, killing cute little baby animals (oil spill) and associate it with all those things that people wouldnt even think about as being ff products.

Ann Dale wrote:

Careful here, the 1970s Conserver Society Project (you will see it all written there what we are talking about) failed because people would not accept doing more with less, and my parents generation associated the project with the Depression. We need to make it sexy, make it fun and make people want to do right and feel good. How?

jalcockwhite wrote:

I don't think the general public would go for this idea. We've talked about the rat race and how people rely on FF to fuel their busy lives. How could we convince someone that they have to work as hard but for less, just to reduce FF use and save the environment?

Some people may see this as a positive way to preserve the world for future generations. Others may see it as hampering their quest for power and a bigger car.

Again, we are in a gray area. It feels like people are being forced to take the less and give away more. How can we make these alternatives seem desireable?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

#203: Author: rvanwyns,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:02 pm

b1jackson wrote:

Packaging does prevent a pretty good sneeze barrier. Take a look sometime in the grocery aisle of a big supermarket how many little sticky fingers picking through the bulk items....candy, etc. I buy spices in bulk but thats about it. Shampoo or cooking oil as Brian mentioned, not bad idea but I think the marketing people would complain if their latest, greatest shampoo with some rare plant as an additive for extra shine was simply dumped into a big ACME shampoo bucket. Like the stuff Willie Coyote always uses!

I read a book, the "Sociology of Everyday Life" I believe. The author suggested packaging provides the actual thrill of shopping. The opening of the package is often replicated for this reason. Malls have doors and then individual stores within shops have doors. The idea is to produce the sensation of opening the package in opening the doors to a host of new commodities. The author also suggested that we almost immediately turn to our next purchase immediately afterwards. I guess the overall idea is that novelty is really important.

#204: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:02 pm

Sorry I may just disappear as I did last night. My time purchased on the computer runs out without warning and then the people behind me are eager to jump on. Time flies on these discussions

#205: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:02 pm

I think you hit the nail on the head with that suggestion Tina. It never ceases to amaze me how quickly people will follow a celebrity regardless of what they are saying, yet even a well spoken argument will fall on deaf ears in our society. I guess the key is sensationalism. People want mindless goo that they can gab about to their buddy.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Tammy wrote:

How to make conservation sexy?

Well, I think we are actually doing that with the younger generation (but not enough with the current generation). I think the new trend in jobs is environmental technicians. The school system has fully integrated environmental issues into the curriculum and it seems to be spewing out budding environmentalists. A lot of at home behaviors are changed because the kids pressure the parents to act. So, in some ways we are making progress.

Celebrity endorsements and reality tv shows????

#206: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:03 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was thought that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

oh my god my office uses so much paper, we have paper backups of everything. Everyone and there dog gets hard copies of monthly reports, when they could be sent via email. I have got the amount of paper reports sent out in the last year, but generally reducing paper consumption has been a challenge. I think all the old timers don't trust or know the capabilities of the computer- they just have to see it on paper. i got asked the other day, how can you read those reports on the computer, i have to print them out. I didn't know how to answer, to me it is just easier--i love track changes!

#207: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:03 pm

Its sad but i think compact flourescent bulb sales must have went through the roof the week after Leo DiCaprio was on Oprah. Even my Mom was asking me how to find his website to find out which fish to eat.

jalcockwhite wrote:

Celebrity status does make a difference. Just think about Daryl Hannah and her biofuel car. People like that attract attention and make others want the same things.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Tammy wrote:

How to make conservation sexy?

Well, I think we are actually doing that with the younger generation (but not enough with the current generation). I think the new trend in jobs is environmental technicians. The school system has fully integrated environmental issues into the curriculum and is seems to be spewing out budding environmentalists. A lot of at home behaviors are changed because the kids pressure the parents to act. So, in some ways we are making progress.

Celebrity endorsements and reality tv shows????

#208: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:03 pm

Because it is too convenient to print rather than writing everything out and making sure we get it right a first time. I also must admit, it took me awhile to get used to reading long documents on the computer. I liked walking around with something in hand. I have become better at not printing, but still am guilty of that at times.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

#209: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:04 pm

Thats OK Johnny, I just had a beer from the glaciers of Creston BC. Thanks guys for sending it all the way to PEI.

Johnny wrote:

I just made a bag of microwave popcorn. I feel so guilty. The kernels are in a paper bag (soaked in edible oil product),over-wrapped with a plastic bag, and in a box. The energy to pop the stuff just emitted about 30 grams of CO2. Sigh :(

jalcockwhite wrote:


How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#210: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:04 pm

Thien Tran wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

I agree with you Brian that it seems I never finish up a 4of whether shampoo or other refillable items because once you open the containers, the shampoo would get oxidized and it does not look or smell as good as it first open. May be go with a smaller size of refillable items. Is it worth it to buy an item only have enough to refill twice?

Some of these 'refilling' companies work fairly well. I know in Victoria you can by 'bulk' products, which are biodegradable. You return the bottle to the vendor for a refund and can pick up your next supply at the same time.

(I bought a 5gallon pail of laundry soap and brought it with me when I moved up here, but I guess I won't get the 5 dolar refund)

#211: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:05 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

I think computers also came with the ability to manipulate so much more data than was previously possible that there was more to print. Also, that little "Print" button is too easy and people don't feel the consequences of their actions. Paper is cheap and people are lazy. I know in my old college we had a huge problem free printers (people coming into our computer labs from other universities, huge bins full of wasted paper) and so the free system had to be replaced with a user pay system. Brian

#212: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:05 pm

Because computers fail and information gets lost. Technology is expensive and harder to transport (it would never fit on my clipboard). I do a lot of work entering files in a database, all of which is printed off and added to a hardcopy file for the shelf. Info could be digital but some people claim to not be as efficient working on a computer. Some people can't read on a computer and I admit, my eyes are burning right now. I've been computering since 8am this morning.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

#213: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:05 pm

People seem so afraid that an awful crash will strike and everything will be wiped out. My office is ridiculous. We must print out all email correspondence with client and put it in a file just in case. Seems crazy.

Johnny wrote:

Because it is too convenient to print rather than writing everything out and making sure we get it right a first time. I also must admit, it took me awhile to get used to reading long documents on the computer. I liked walking around with something in hand. I have become better at not printing, but still am guilty of that at times.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

#214: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:06 pm

We use as much or more paper because computers fail, because some people still want a paper record of everything (think government - Barry didn't you say you had to print and file a copy of every email?), because we are used to and like having tangible items.

#215: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:06 pm

I think we still put all of the things we used to down on paper. Plus we now print our emails, research, legislation, and other things off the Internet. And I know I always print things to edit them. A lot of times more than once. If I was using a type writer or writing something by hand I definitely wouldn't be going through so many copies.

shawn samborsky wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

If not for JFKs golf clubs the venture would have been a success

#216: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:07 pm

So take a baby step Johnny and go buy some bulk popcorn kernels - in a reuseable container - and use an air popper. It takes no longer than a microwave. Then you could dress it with some more environmentally friendly food products.

Johnny wrote:

I just made a bag of microwave popcorn. I feel so guilty. The kernels are in a paper bag (soaked in edible oil product), over-wrapped with a plastic bag, and in a box. The energy to pop the stuff just emitted about 30 grams of CO2. Sigh :(

jalcockwhite wrote:

How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#217: Author: Tina Hessdorfer,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:07 pm

thnx all this has been great, but i have to run -- gotta catch my bus or i will stranded at the office! see yah tomorrow

#218: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:08 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was thought that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

I think it failed because computers made it easier to create documents and communicate, but despite we now have electronic formats of documentation and communication, people still have the perception that the hard copies are still necessary for record keeping or back up purposes.

#219: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:08 pm

Anonymous wrote:

jlauik wrote:

So how can we make money off reducing and reusing? There are profit made from recycling. I don't think the general public is willing to make less mola.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point, Jason, reduce and reuse are underrated.

Might be a policy question eh Jason? I say tradeable permits (that was my answer for everything). Kidding!

Ahh tradeable permits..I refuse the temptation to discuss this..maybe policy with a combination of marketing for products that are reusable or reduced (as Andrew mentioned)

Actually a sin tax type system for non-reusables might be as close as we get

#220: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:08 pm

Printing and filing everything. Oh dear. that is a problem.

#221: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:08 pm

cpiedt wrote:

Ann Dale wrote:

Careful here, the 1970s Conserver Society Project (you will see it all written there what we are talking about) failed because people would not accept doing more with less, and my parents generation associated the project with the Depression. We need to make it sexy, make it fun and make people want to do right and feel good. How?

jalcockwhite wrote:

I don't think the general public would go for this idea. We've talked about the rat race and how people rely on FF to fuel their busy lives. How could we convince someone that they have to work as hard but for less, just to reduce FF use and save the environment?

Some people may see this as a positive way to preserve the world for future generations. Others may see it as hampering their quest for power and a bigger car.


Again, we are in a gray area. It feels like people are being forced to take the less and give away more. How can we make these alternatives seem desirable?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Do you notice how we come quickly into gray areas? Places where different environmental values overlap? Local meat versus factory farm soy from California, cutting more timber versus plastic? And of course oil based is cheapest. So another question- are you, as individuals, willing to have less money in exchange for using less oil (ie your products will all cost more) Do you think the public is in general?

Personally, I don't want a lot of stuff, because it would just sit around my house and get dusty, making me look dirty (I don't dust). I don't want big house because I would have to spend my time cleaning it and I would rather have time to do other stuff. My current place is 800 some square feet and I love it. It's clean from top to bottom in about 1/2 and hour. Great for when my mother in law decides to give me a surprise visit. I think people need to realize that they would have more time if they go back to a simple life. Don't we all want more time?

There seems to be such a motivation for society to attempt to destress, hence the whole yoga craze but the message of declutter and simplify is not getting through. If only "The Simple Life" tv show was more a model of this than making fun of rich people trying to live in a lower class standard of living. The media is the key in all of this really.

#222: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:09 pm

It failed because of old behaviours, older people 'feel' they can't read on screen, simply because they are not used to it. Again, it was one of my students who helped me break this mental barrier, I had just got a palm pilot but was still printing out my monthly calendar, because I needed to see it all at a glance and carry it around with me, and he said, my goal is to have a paperless office, and the light bulb went on for me, and I forced myself to learn new skills on-line, out of which evolved these e-Dialogues. I shall be forever grateful to the younger people who (a) make me aware of my paradigms and (b) push me to change.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

I think computers also came with the ability to manipulate so much more data than was previously possible that there was more to print. Also, that little "Print" button is too easy and people don't feel the consequences of their actions. Paper is cheap and people are lazy. I know in my old college we had a huge problem free printers (people coming into our computer labs from other universities, huge bins full of wasted paper) and so the free system had to be replaced with a user pay system. Brian

#223: Author: Adrian Paradis,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:09 pm

Amy Wilson wrote:

We use as much or more paper because computers fail, because some people still want a paper record of everything (think government - Barry didn't you say you had to print and file a copy of every email?), because we are used to and like having tangible items.

We have a hard copy in the public registry and an electronic (CD) in there too. Then we scan the document and put it on the registry.

It is getting better, when I started I got 30 hard copies and 5 CDs for each application. Now, 5 Hard and 30 CD for distribution. Change is occuring in the government, just takes a little time.

#224: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:09 pm

I also feel the paper waste has to do with underlying behaviors. People love hard copies. They still want to read an article from a tangible piece of paper. And how many times have you printed off what you thought was your final copy, only to find one little error and have to reprint. And you are right Brian, we don't think before we hit that print button. I rarely see City of Calgary employees printing double sided (unless it is the default setting) and it is supposed to be one of our policies.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

I think computers also came with the ability to manipulate so much more data than was previously possible that there was more to print. Also, that little "Print" button is too easy and people don't feel the consequences of their actions. Paper is cheap and people are lazy. I know in my old college we had a huge problem free printers (people coming into our computer labs from other universities, huge bins full of wasted paper) and so the free system had to be replaced with a user pay system. Brian

#225: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:09 pm

I have an air popper, and do use that most of the time. I have the microwawe stuff for when my daughter is sleeping so that the air popper will not wake her. I'm a popcorn addict.

jacockwhite wrote:

So take a baby step Johnny and go buy some bulk popcorn kernels - in a reuseable container - and use an air popper. It takes no longer than a microwave. Then you could dress it with some more environmentally friendly food products.

Johnny wrote:

I just made a bag of microwave popcorn. I feel so guilty. The kernels are in a paper bag (soaked in edible oil product),over-wrapped with a plastic bag, and in a box. The energy to pop the stuff just emitted about 30 grams of CO2. Sigh :(

jacockwhite wrote:

How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:**Lenore Newman wrote:**

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#226: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:10 pm

I think the paperless office failed even despite the computer is because the computer actually made it easier to print more paper since every computer is attached to a printer. Its just so easy now, to print and to have lots of things.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

#227: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:11 pm

Great point, when building the infrastructure for oil and gas distribution the demand for its benefits was huge - now that that basic or essential demand is not present the alternatives will remain just that. How to convince people to pay for the infrastructure when they already receive the benefit.

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

jodi jane friesen wrote:

It means that with such a developed network of infrastructures and dependent technologies built around fossil fuels, it would take an incredible amount of restructuring to change this dependence.

This certainly gives an advantage to the suppliers of fossil fuels in the ability to make money...however, it might mean that if a very similar alternative exists that is not fossil fuel based then it could be a viable substitute using the same infrastructure and networks, like biofuels/biomass

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ok, before we all start thinking about "edible oil products" (and just what does that mean? Scary) think about this. what are the bad points of, well, everything containing fossil fuels, but more importantly, what are the good points? What advantage does this give someone?

Unfortunately the worlds reliance on fossil fuels and developed infrastructure makes for an uncompetative market--it makes it difficult to introduce new technology

#228: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:11 pm

Yes, the internet has created access to resources that we could have never imagined just a few years ago, now all that information has to be tranfered to hard copies over and over again.

And doesn't the technology of printers just keep getting faster and faster, making it even easier.

#229: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:12 pm

...lol...the options...we need to be prepared and think ahead...

jalcockwhite wrote:

So take a baby step Johnny and go buy some bulk popcorn kernels - in a reuseable container - and use an air popper. It takes no longer than a microwave. Then you could dress it with some more environmentally friendly food products.

Johnny wrote:

I just made a bag of microwave popcorn. I feel so guilty. The kernels are in a paper bag (soaked in edible oil product),over-wrapped with a plastic bag, and in a box. The energy to pop the stuff just emitted about 30 grams of CO2. Sigh :(

jalcockwhite wrote:

How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#230: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:12 pm

sorry I totally lost my connection.

#231: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:13 pm

Two strong themes we're listing are the need for hard copies for record keeping and the ability to read off of the computer screen. At my company we burn our projects to CD and put them in a safe. It works just fine. As for reading off of a computer, it does take awhile to adjust. It took me awhile (I didn't own a computer until 2000, prior to that it was a typewriter believe it or not). Brian

#232: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:13 pm

Okay then, I guess that could be an acceptable excuse :)

Johnny wrote:

I have an air popper, and do use that most of the time. I have the microwave stuff for when my daughter is sleeping so that the air popper will not wake her. I'm a popcorn addict.

jalcockwhite wrote:

So take a baby step Johnny and go buy some bulk popcorn kernels - in a reuseable container - and use an air popper. It takes no longer than a microwave. Then you could dress it with some more environmentally friendly food products.

Johnny wrote:

I just made a bag of microwave popcorn. I feel so guilty. The kernels are in a paper bag (soaked in edible oil product), over-wrapped with a plastic bag, and in a box. The energy to pop the stuff just emitted about 30 grams of CO2. Sigh :(

jalcockwhite wrote:

How does freshness apply to some piece of home hardware or plastic kids toys? I'd say that kind of packaging is completely unnecessary.

Anonymous wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Catherine brings up a good point. What can we do about overwrapping? No one likes it, but we seem stuck with it. What barriers do you see to more widespread use of bulk and refillables?

I think the reason we see so much packaging is partially to advertise what's inside and also the need to seal things so they stay fresh during transportation. So if time and preservation is the issue, I'd side with people who want to see more emphasis on buying locally produced goods. This way they could be produced and consumed quickly due to a short transportation route. Brian

#233: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:14 pm

Good point everyone- it is the law of unintended consequences. Technology made printing easier, so we do more of it. we have energy efficient homes, and make them twice as big as they were in 1950. We can't win for losing it seems.

#234: Author: Andrew Marshall,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:14 pm

I agree Brian that so much paper is used because of simplicity factor and sheer laziness by businesses. We have a mindset now that since we have recycle bins and paper shredders that we can use an endless supply of paper. Also, the requirements for having numerous copies of documents that businesses set is a little ridiculous. However, it will be hard now to change our ways because of how it will directly effect the number of paper recycling companies that our out there making profits from excessive paper use.

#235: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:14 pm

and apparantely my identity. Kim

Anonymous wrote:

sorry I totally lost my connection.

#236: Author: jlasuik,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:14 pm

I must go, and say thanks for the discussion before I get cut off.

Good night -(its 'after 11:00 here)

Ate breve,

Jason

#237: Author: Faron Knott,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:14 pm

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

I agree Tina we use an extreme amount of paper around our office as well; everyone needs a hard copy. I shouldn't complain, after all we are in the paper making business but sometimes I feel that we are our own best customer.

oh my god my office uses so much paper, we have paper backups of everything. Everyone and there dog gets hard copies of monthly reports, when they could be sent via email. I have got the amount of paper reports sent out in the last year, but generally reducing paper consumption has been a challenge. I think all the old timers don't trust or know the capabilities of the computer- they just have to see it on paper. i got asked the other day, how can you read those reports on the computer, i have to print them out. I didn't know how to answer, to me it is just easier--i love track changes!

#238: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:15 pm

Good point Monica. Now we are printing maps, pictures, and airline tickets. This is a significant paper use that emerged with computers.

Monica wrote:

Yes, the internet has created access to resources that we could have never imagined just a few years ago, now all that information has to be tranfered to hard copies over and over again.

And doesn't the technology of printers just keep getting faster and faster, making it even easier.

#239: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:15 pm

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

#240: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:16 pm

How can we begin to teach people that just becasue we can go bigger, higher, farther, faster etc doesnt mean we should or that it will be beneficial to us.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point everyone- it is the law of unintended consequences. Technology made printing easier, so we do more of it. we have energy efficient homes, and make them twice as big as they were in 1950. We can't win for losing it seems.

#241: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:16 pm

jodi jane friesen wrote:

I think the paperless office failed even despite the computer is because the computer actually made it easier to print more paper since every computer is attached to a printer. Its just so easy now, to print and to have lots of things.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

I think there is the view that a digital copy of something isn't 'official'. It is harder to 'doctor' a paper copy of something than a digital copy. Paranoia contributes as well.

#242: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:16 pm

With respect to "etherialization" of the economy, take computers for example, why do we have to buy new equipment rather than simply keep the shell and have the software and insides updated? Washing machines are now available that don't use soap, use laser cleaning instead.

#243: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:17 pm

The project that I work on right now is this ridiculous - contractual requirements to send out copies of all ems documents that no one reads but the 17 spare for the binders, and main failing.

Andrew Marshall wrote:

I agree Brian that so much paper is used because of simplicity factor and sheer laziness by businesses. We have a mindset now that since we have recycle bins and paper shredders that we can use an endless supply of paper. Also, the requirements for having numerous copies of documents that businesses set is a little ridiculous. However, it will be hard now to change our ways because of how it will directly effect the number of paper recycling companies that our out there making profits from excessive paper use.

#244: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:18 pm

True, my dad is building a house in Metchosin; it's huge. It's being built for a woman with severe allergies to chemicals of all sorts. The house is piped full of oxygen with outlets all over the place and is built with completely green materials. However, the thing has a huge footprint overlooking the ocean with all sorts of extra perks (such as an indoor glass canyon thing). You'd think someone who suffers so much at the hand of technology would be more aware of their own impact.

Lenore Newman wrote:

Good point everyone- it is the law of unintended consequences. Technology made printing easier, so we do more of it. we have energy efficient homes, and make them twice as big as they were in 1950. We can't win for losing it seems.

#245: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:19 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

I don't know. That's a tough one but I do know that the more money we have, the more we buy and the more we consume.

#246: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:19 pm

[economics - for one only new products get counted in the gdp not transferring of used items and 2 buying more equals growth, progress.

quote="Ann Dale"]With respect to "etherialization" of the economy, take computers for example, why do we have to buy new equipment rather than simply keep the shell and have the software and insides updated? Washing machines are now available that don't use soap, use laser cleaning instead.[/quote]

#247: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:19 pm

Especially in Canada where we pride ourselves on our wide open spaces, and our clear cut forest are kept out of veiw from major roadways it is hard to actuall show people a problem. I think that uses economic forces is probably the best way to get the fastest response

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

#248: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:19 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

I think economic incentives are a big part of the solution, but outside of that there's education / moral suasion. Like I always maintain, nobody forces me to ride my bike to work, or take things to the recycling depot on the weekend. I do it because it sits right with my values. And where do those values come from? The influence of our parents and schools I would say. Once "thinking green" is ingrained into our behaviour it sticks (and I think we can affect others with it too). Brian

#249: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:20 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

Price shocks at the pumps recently did seem to have an impact right? Can we do better?, I'm sure it's possible but would a much greater effort be required? likely

#250: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:20 pm

Well, now that's a new one. How in the world would lasers make mud go away. Would it vaporize the particles and suck them out somewhere?

Ann Dale wrote:

With respect to "etherialization" of the economy, take computers for example, why do we have to buy new equipment rather than simply keep the shell and have the software and insides updated? Washing machines are now available that don't use soap, use laser cleaning instead.

#251: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:21 pm

Soemtimes I really chuckle to myself when I see the 20 m buffer on the highway before the clear cut starts when I've seen where that much of a reserve has not even been left in a riparian zone in other places - in the name of tourism and public perception.

Meghan King wrote:

Especially in Canada where we pride ourselves on our wide open spaces, and our clear cut forest are kept out of veiw from major roadways it is hard to actual show people a problem. I think that uses economic forces is probably the best way to get the fastest response

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

#252: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:21 pm

I think education does play a role in consumption. There are still people who are unaware of the impact of alot of their actions. We need to find a way to express the damages incurred in terms that will cause their significance to be recognized. But ultimately I guess this comes back to price shocks.

#253: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:21 pm

I believe price shocks are the best option when working within our current societal structure. But, ideally if we could change our values and consumer patterns we would be better off because we wouldn't be hurting those that live on the poverty line and don't have the luxury of paying more to protect the environment.

cpiedt wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

I don't know. That's a tough one but I do know that the more money we have, the more we buy and the more we consume.

#254: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:22 pm


And liely at the end of the project you will have to send out an additional copy of all the documents in a nice bound company document. Its really is crazy.

Anonymous wrote:

The project that I work on right now is this ridiculous - contractual requirements to send out copies of all ems documents that no one reads but the 17 spare for the binders, and main failing.

Andrew Marshall wrote:

I agree Brian that so much paper is used because of simplicity factor and sheer laziness by businesses. We have a mindset now that since we have recycle bins and paper shredders that we can use an endless supply of paper. Also, the requirements for having numerous copies of documents that businesses set is a little ridiculou. However, it will be hard now to change our ways because of how it will directly effect the number of paper recycling companies that our out there making profits from excessive paper use.

#255: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:22 pm

Sorry, don't know the details, it is a Japanese company, will try to find the reference.

jalcockwhite wrote:

Well, now that's a new one. How in the world would lasers make mud go away. Would it vaporize the particles and suck them out somewhere?

Ann Dale wrote:

With respect to "etherialization" of the economy, take computers for example, why do we have to buy new equipment rather than simply keep the shell and have the software and insides updated? Washing machines are now available that don't use soap, use laser cleaning instead.

#256: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:22 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

Price shocks at the pumps recently did seem to have an impact right? Can we do better?, I'm sure it's possible but would a much greater effort be required? likely

#257: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:22 pm

Running out of something is a good way to stop using it.

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

#258: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:23 pm

I agree Brian, economic incentives will have to be one of the major incentives, but other things (such as education and moral suasion) are changing our society and need to be fostered for continued change.

#259: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:24 pm

The ultimate control on consumption has to come from a change of behaviour some how. One of the best way to change a behaviour is to learn how to replace it with something else that is better or equally as good (at least thats what my friends therapists say) So teaching people how to find better alternatives, such as happiness from within, spending time with kids, playing more...all instead of consuming and buying more things.

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think price shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

#260: Author: Andrew Marshall,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:25 pm

Anonymous wrote:

Sometimes I really chuckle to myself when I see the 20 m buffer on the highway before the clear cut starts when I've seen where that much of a reserve has not even been left in a riparian zone in other places - in the name of tourism and public perception.

Meghan King wrote:

Especially in Canada where we pride ourselves on our wide open spaces, and our clear cut forest are kept out of view from major roadways it is hard to actually show people a problem. I think that using economic forces is probably the best way to get the fastest response

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think price shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

We do have regulations in place to control consumption somewhat. The ALR is an one example that I can think of that controls the amount of land being developed for residential and/or commercial purposes.

#261: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:25 pm

As always, we have managed to cover an astounding array of material in a short time. Let's cut off a bit early tonight- it is Friday after all. Let's take ten more minutes to wrap up some thoughts, and hopefully everyone can take away some positive thoughts on how to cut energy use. Also remember that tomorrow Ann will be taking over for me as they will be scanning my brain. (and what a fun way to spend a Saturday it is) I will read the transcripts later, so no ganging up on Ann. :)

#262: Author: rvanwyns,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:26 pm

cpiedt wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think price shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

I don't know. That's a tough one but I do know that the more money we have, the more we buy and the more we consume.

A grad student quoted Winnipeg Mayor Glenn Murray yesterday and I'll paraphrase. Apparently Murray, along with a bunch of mayors was all excited about Kyoto. They were going to do this and that to ensure Canada met its targets. A social scientist then walked into the celebration and told them that for every change in behaviour or policy that leads to reduced consumption (e.g., fuel) there is a corresponding increase in consumption.

#263: Author: Meghan King,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:26 pm


Cheers

Lenore Newman wrote:

As always, we have managed to cover an astounding array of material in a short time. Let's cut off a bit early tonight- it is Friday after all. Let's take ten more minutes to wrap up some thoughts, and hopefully everyone can take away some positive thoughts on how to cut energy use. Also remember that tomorrow Ann will be taking over for me as they will be scanning my brain. (and what a fun way to spend a Saturday it is) I will read the transcripts later, so no ganging up on Ann. :)

#264: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:27 pm

What is the topic tomorrow?

#265: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:28 pm

Tomorrow, I would like us to get real and dirty. We are going to develop an energy security policy for Canada, so have a glass of wine and put your thinking hats on. What would it look like?

Lenore Newman wrote:

As always, we have managed to cover an astounding array of material in a short time. Let's cut off a bit early tonight- it is Friday after all. Let's take ten more minutes to wrap up some thoughts, and hopefully everyone can take away some positive thoughts on how to cut energy use. Also remember that tomorrow Ann will be taking over for me as they will be scanning my brain. (and what a fun way to spend a Saturday it is) I will read the transcripts later, so no ganging up on Ann. :)

#266: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:28 pm

Ann? What is the topic tomorrow ;)

#267: Author: Dawn,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:28 pm

An excellent discussion, as always. This group always gets me thinking. I find it interesting how many

different points of view, and creative ideas, can be expressed in regard to the same post. Have a great weekend everyone.

#268: Author: Guest, ▣ Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:28 pm

Lenore, where can we access a transcript of the previous discussions it would be nice to look back at it or use some information for the summary assignment.

Meghan King wrote:

Cheers

Lenore Newman wrote:

As always, we have managed to cover an astounding array of material in a short time. Let's cut off a bit early tonight- it is friday after all. Lets take ten more minutes to wrap up some thoughts, and hopefully everyone can take away some positive thoughts on how to cut energy use. Also remember that tomorrow Ann will be taking over for me as they will be scanning my brain. (and what a fun way to spend a Saturday it is) I will read the transcripts later, so no ganging up on Ann. :)

#269: Author: Thien Tran, ▣ Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:28 pm

Faron Knott wrote:

Tina Hessdorfer wrote:

Lenore Newman wrote:

Wow, this has been great so far, and I have been leading, very slowly to a point- this kind of thinking is called "etherialization" of the economy, that is trying to disconnect as much as possible from using tons and tons of physical resources. The problem is that it is harder than we thought...I pose another question, slightly unrelated but an interesting example...it was though that the invention of computers would lead to a paperless office- why then, do we use more paper in business than ever- why did this particular etherialization fail?

I agree Tina we use an extreme amount of paper around our office as well; everyone needs a hard copy. I shouldn't complain, after all we are in the paper making business but sometimes I feel that we are our own best customer.

oh my god my office uses so much paper, we have paper backups of everything. Everyone and there dog gets hard copies of monthly reports, when they could be sent via email. I have got the amount of paper reports sent out in the last year, but generally reducing paper consumption has been a challenge. I think all the old timers don't trust or know the capabilities of the computer- they just have to see it on paper. i got asked the other day, how can you read those reports on the computer, i have to print them out. I didn't know how to answer, to me it is just easier--i love track changes!

I know that lot of time we print more documents at the office than we would do at home (like our homeworks) because ink are quite expensive to buy, especially those color one. Would management let us go crazy printing at the office if the price of ink is a burnden (more expensive) for running business. Or the cost will transfer to consumers any way ?!

#270: Author: Ann Dale, ▣ Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:29 pm

We are going to pretend to be high level Privy Council officials drafting an energy security bill to convince

our political masters?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ann? What is the topic tomorrow ;)

#271: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:29 pm

What about programs to improve health and longevity. A lot of people seem to be into anti-aging and are willing to spend money on products that promote a long and beautiful life. Physical exercise is proven to improve stamina and health and it doesn't require fossil fuels. If people could be convinced that biking to work and walking places provides them with valuable benefits, maybe they'd be more willing to change. Laziness has to be overcome. Speaking of which, there are a few people in my neighborhood who walk their dogs by car. Unbelievable but true!

jodi jane friesen wrote:

The ultimate control on consumption has to come from a change of behaviour some how. One of the best way to change a behaviour is to learn how to replace it with something else that is better or equally as good (at least thats what my friends therapists say) So teaching people how to find better alternatives, such as happiness from within, spending time with kids, playing more...all instead of consuming and buying more things.

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think price shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

#272: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:29 pm

Education combined with alternative choices. I do believe the majority of people who have the message will ultimately want to do what is best for sustainability to ensure their children and future generations do not suffer for our mistakes.

Dawn wrote:

I think education does play a role in consumption. There are still people who are unaware of the impact of alot of their actions. We need to find a way to express the damages incurred in terms that will cause their significance to be recognized. But ultimately I guess this comes back to price shocks.

#273: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:30 pm

Transcripts should be available at this site again by tomorrow. Our technical wizard is working on it.

#274: Author: Kevin Bill,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:30 pm

Lenore Newman wrote:

As always, we have managed to cover an astounding array of material in a short time. Let's cut off a bit early tonight- it is friday after all. Lets take ten more minutes to wrap up some thoughts, and hopefully everyone can take away some positive thoughts on how to cut energy use. Also remember that tomorrow Ann will be taking over for me as they will be scanning my brain. (and what a fun way to spend a Saturday it is) I will read the transcripts later, so no ganging up on Ann. :)

I think that society can become more sustainable by becoming a little 'smarter'. Smarter design (building,

packaging etc), smarter consumption (buy more energy efficient products), and smarter behaviour (not let your car run for 15 minutes in the Winter, guilty as charged!). As outlined by Lovins and Hawken, we can make significant gains by increasing our 'negawatts'.

#275: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:31 pm

I think we could reduce energy by hitting two birds with one stone.

Maybe those that can afford to should be obligated to donate to charities and learn to live with less. I have been working on a United Way Campaign and have gained a little insight into how little some people live on and how many people in our own communities need. In some ways it has made me reassess some purchases. Do I really need a new item, or can I do without? As Jain mentioned the more we have the more we spend. So, by increasing donations to charities you help your community (helping address the issue of spirituality perhaps) and hopefully reduce your consumption.

Just a thought that might be off the beaten track a bit.

#276: Author: cpiedt,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:31 pm

Well, this has been another interesting discussion that I have really enjoyed. I think as a whole, we are realizing that we need to change the way we consume our resources and we are working to do that. The problem, though, is that even if we find a solution to an existing problem now, the solution won't last long as the world population continues to grow so fast. I think we will always have to be finding alternative solutions with the growth rate the way it is. Anyway, goodnight everyone and thanks. Good luck tomorrow, Lenore.

#277: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:31 pm

land use planning, regulations are important but through a previous project I learned that some zoning laws were constraining a zerowaste initiative

Andrew Marshall wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Soemtimes I really chuckle to myself when I see the 20 m buffer on the highway before the clear cut starts when I've seen where that much of a reserve has not even been left in a riparian zone in other places - in the name of tourism and public perception.

Meghan King wrote:

Especially in Canada where we pride ourselves on our wide open spaces, and our clear cut forest are kept out of veiw from major roadways it is hard to actual show people a problem. I think that uses economic forces is probably the best way to get the fastest response

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

We do have regulations in place to control consumption somewhat. The ALR is an one example that I can think of that controls the amount of land being developed for residential and/or commercial purposes.

#278: Author: Monica, 📅 Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:31 pm

Sorry, but silly question.... What time is our e-dialog tomorrow?

Ann Dale wrote:

We are going to pretend to be high level Privy Council officials drafting an energy security bill to convince our political masters?

Lenore Newman wrote:

Ann? What is the topic tomorrow ;)

#279: Author: jalcockwhite, 📅 Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:31 pm

Yes, but the regulations for ALR's aren't as strict as operations on private or crown land. For example, a site I recently inspected was on an ALR and therefore, not required to have spill kits on site, even though they had some huge generators and diesel tanks.

Andrew Marshall wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Sometimes I really chuckle to myself when I see the 20 m buffer on the highway before the clear cut starts when I've seen where that much of a reserve has not even been left in a riparian zone in other places - in the name of tourism and public perception.

Meghan King wrote:

Especially in Canada where we pride ourselves on our wide open spaces, and our clear cut forest are kept out of view from major roadways it is hard to actually show people a problem. I think that uses economic forces is probably the best way to get the fastest response

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think price shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

We do have regulations in place to control consumption somewhat. The ALR is an one example that I can think of that controls the amount of land being developed for residential and/or commercial purposes.

#280: Author: Faron Knott, 📅 Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:32 pm

Good night everyone ... I hope everything turns out fine Lenore

Lenore Newman wrote:

As always, we have managed to cover an astounding array of material in a short time. Let's cut off a bit early tonight- it is Friday after all. Let's take ten more minutes to wrap up some thoughts, and hopefully everyone can take away some positive thoughts on how to cut energy use. Also remember that tomorrow Ann will be taking over for me as they will be scanning my brain. (and what a fun way to spend a Saturday it is) I will read the transcripts later, so no ganging up on Ann. :)

#281: Author: Ann Dale,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:32 pm

The dialogue tomorrow starts at 10:00 a.m. to noon PST, and there is no such thing as a silly question. Lenore, go well and safely tomorrow, our thoughts are with you.

#282: Author: Guest,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:32 pm

Bye till tomorrow - Kim.

Anonymous wrote:

land use planning, regulations are important but through a previous project I learned that some zoning laws were constraining a zerowaste initiative

Andrew Marshall wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Sometimes I really chuckle to myself when I see the 20 m buffer on the highway before the clear cut starts when I've seen where that much of a reserve has not even been left in a riparian zone in other places - in the name of tourism and public perception.

Meghan King wrote:

Especially in Canada where we pride ourselves on our wide open spaces, and our clear cut forest are kept out of view from major roadways it is hard to actually show people a problem. I think that uses economic forces is probably the best way to get the fastest response

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think price shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

We do have regulations in place to control consumption somewhat. The ALR is an one example that I can think of that controls the amount of land being developed for residential and/or commercial purposes.

#283: Author: jodi jane friesen,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:33 pm

wine at 10am...whew, its gonna be a big day tomorrow!

Ann Dale wrote:

Tomorrow, I would like us to get real and dirty. We are going to develop an energy security policy for Canada, so have a glass of wine and put your thinking hats on. What would it look like?

Lenore Newman wrote:

As always, we have managed to cover an astounding array of material in a short time. Let's cut off a bit early tonight- it is Friday after all. Lets take ten more minutes to wrap up some thoughts, and hopefully everyone can take away some positive thoughts on how to cut energy use. Also remember that tomorrow Ann will be taking over for me as they will be scanning my brain. (and what a fun way to spend a Saturday it is) I will read the transcripts later, so no ganging up on Ann. :)

#284: Author: Tammy,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:33 pm

Thanks everyone for a lovely discussion. As always, it was a pleasure. Talk to you all tomorrow.

#285: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:34 pm

Ann Dale wrote:

With respect to "etherialization" of the economy, take computers for example, why do we have to buy new equipment rather than simply keep the shell and have the software and insides updated? Washing machines are now available that don't use soap, use laser cleaning instead.

It appears that we live in an ever disposable world and the trend does not appear to be changing. Not sure what we can do to change that trend.

#286: Author: Lenore Newman,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:34 pm

The dialogue tomorrow is 10am pacific time, or 1pm eastern And yes, I will be hoping for the no tumour option tomorrow.

#287: Author: Johnny,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:34 pm

Your point got me thinking Jain. Puplic health is often used by bearucrats now to convince their ministers to approve projects. Also, free-riders in the public may impeede progress of this. For example, someone would think that "active living programs would be great because less people would be on the roads. That way I could drive my Hummer to work in less traffic" :)

jalcockwhite wrote:

What about programs to improve health and longevity. A lot of people seem to be into anti-aging and are willing to spend money on products that promote a long and beautiful life. Physical exercise is proven to improve stamina and health and it doesn't require fossil fuels. If people could be convinced that biking to work and walking places provides them with valuable benefits, maybe they'd be more willing to change. Laziness has to be overcome. Speaking of which, there are a few people in my neighborhood who walk their dogs by car. Unbelievable but true!

jodi jane friesen wrote:

The ultimate control on consuption has to come from a change of behaviour some how. One of the best way to change a behaviour is to learn how to replace it with something else that is better or equaly as good (at least thats what my friends therapists say) So teaching people how to find better alternatives, such as happyness from within, spending time with kids, playing more...all instead of consuming and buying more things.

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

#288: Author: jalcockwhite,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:34 pm

Great discussion! Good Luck Lenore.

I may not be able to participate tomorrow but will definitely read the transcripts.

Is two out of three e-dialogues okay?

#289: Author: Monica,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:35 pm

Good night everyone. I have a sick little girl to attend to, so signing off early is greatly appreciated.

Take care tomorrow Lenore, and good luck with everything.

#290: Author: b1jackson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:35 pm

I'm going to reduce my power consumption by turning off this plastic cover electrical box called a computer. Good nite all and yes, good luck tomorrow Lenore.

See ya in the discussions Team 1

#291: Author: kristawatts,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:37 pm

[quote="jalcockwhite"]Yes, but the regulations for ALR's aren't as strict as operations on private or crown land. For example, a site I recently inspected was on an ALR and therefore, not required to have spill kits on site, even though they had some huge generators and diesel tanks.

Andrew Marshall wrote:

Anonymous wrote:

Soemtimes I really chuckle to myself when I see the 20 m buffer on the highway before the clear cut starts when I've seen where that much of a reserve has not even been left in a riparian zone in other places - in the name of tourism and public perception.

Meghan King wrote:

Especially in Canada where we pride ourselves on our wide open spaces, and our clear cut forest are kept out of veiw from major roadways it is hard to actual show people a problem. I think that uses economic forces is probably the best way to get the fastest response

Lenore Newman wrote:

So do people think proce shocks are the only ultimate control on consumption? Or can we do better than that?

We do have regulations in place to control consumption somewhat. The ALR is an one example that I can think of that controls the amount of land being developed for residential and/or commercial purposes.

Super frustrating that Agriculture enterprises are not subject to riparian area regulations and are allowed to so many things because of hte right to farm Act.

#292: Author: Andrew Marshall,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:39 pm

Well I guess that is a wrap. Great discussion all. Good luck with tomorrow Lenore, I hope all will be well.

#293: Author: Amy Wilson,  Posted: Fri Nov 18, 2005 5:40 pm

thanks everyone, chat with you tomorrow.

Page 1 of 1

printer-friendly topic mod

Powered by phpBB2.0.11 ©