Response ID ANON-NZPP-DR8D-T

Submitted to Climate action for Aotearoa Submitted on 2021-03-28 17:23:56

Introduction

What is your name? What is your organisation (if applicable)?

Name (enter in text box):

The Rubbish Trip

What is your email address?

Email (write into text box):

blumhardt.hannah@gmail.com

In what capacity are you responding to this survey?

In what capacity are you responding to this survey? Select from the dropdown list.:

NGO

Add other/more than one capacity if applicable:

(Optional) Specify iwi/hap■ affiliation, or if a mandated representative specify iwi/hap■/pan-iwi organisation, M■ori-collective* or M■ori organisation you represent.:

What part of Aotearoa are you from?

What part of Aotearoa are you from? Select from the dropdown list) .:

Wellington (Te Whanga-nui-a-Tara)

Please specify if you are from outside Aotearoa:

What is your age group?

25-34

Confidentiality and disclosure

Yes

How this consultation works

Do you want to continue with the consultation questions or do you want to submit a pre-prepared response?

I want to continue with the consultation questions

File upload:

No file uploaded

Are you here to tell us your one big thing?

Your one big thing:

Your one big thing::

The Rubbish Trip (www.therubbishtrip.co.nz) is a two-person project that conducts zero waste advocacy and activism, including nationwide talks about zero waste living. Our one big thing relates to zero waste and the need for the Commission to take a holistic approach that considers all waste streams and the role that zero waste and circular economy strategies can play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with linear consumption. We fully support and endorse the joint submission of the zero waste community on the Climate Change Commission's consultation.

Given the content of the zero waste community submission aligns with the key messages we wish to convey, we have decided not to reiterate them here, and rather to focus our submission on sharing our view on how the Commission's transport recommendations could be strengthened.

Through The Rubbish Trip, we travelled New Zealand full-time for 3 years giving talks across the country, from Kaitaia to Rakiura/Stewart Island. We were committed to travelling as low-emissions as possible. For the first 18 months we had a small car that we used to get between main centres (with our bicycles on the back, which we used once we arrived in a town or region to reduce our car usage). However, after the first 18 months we sold our car and committed to travelling the country via public transport and hitchhiking only (http://therubbishtrip.co.nz/thoughts-and-musings/the-rubbish-trip-has-gone-car-free/). We have

always been committed not to fly for The Rubbish Trip (http://therubbishtrip.co.nz/thoughts-and-musings/why-we-dont-fly/), and we are members of No Fly Cli-Sci (https://noflyclimatesci.org/biographies/hannah-blumhardt-and-liam-prince). Over the course of a year, we calculated our emissions savings from our alternative approach to transporting ourselves across the country (car-free, flight-free). Our calculations showed significant emissions savings from our approach (See http://therubbishtrip.co.nz/thoughts-and-musings/6-monthly-transport-footprint-5-october-2018-5-april-2019/ and http://therubbishtrip.co.nz/thoughts-and-musings/6-monthly-transport-footprint-5-april-2019-5-october-2019/).

However, our experience of travelling New Zealand full-time without flying, and also travelling the country for over a year without a private car, has taught us much about the inadequacy of New Zealand's public transport system, and the lack of convenient and accessible land-based intra-regional transport to compete with flying. Many times public transport was so lacking, inconvenient or expensive, that it was simply easier and cheaper for us to hitch-hike. We have also been astounded by the anti-cycling culture in New Zealand and how dangerous it can be to cycle in towns and cities (we wouldn't consider cycling on state highways). We are only able to travel car-free and flight-free because we have built The Rubbish Trip around our approach to transport and because we are willing to accept considerable delays, discomfort, cost, and inconvenience, and because we are open to hitch-hiking. However, these peculiarities are not feasible or desirable for many people!

We were pleased to see that the Commission has recommended an upgrade of New Zealand's national public transport network and the promotion of active forms of transport. However, we believe that this should be the time-critical action with progress indicators (not just a lower-order necessary action). While we agree that the light vehicle fleet must be electrified, we do not believe that this is more important than upgrading the New Zealand public transport network and making it easier to walk and cycle. We would like to see the latter become a time-critical action and be given progress indicators.

Furthermore, we do not think the Commission has given enough attention to the fact that current rates of private car ownership are not sustainable and that we cannot substitute every ICE car with an EV. Electrification of the light vehicle fleet needs to be combined with meaningful measures to reduce total car ownership. We believe that EVs and investment should be prioritised for shared forms of transport, whether public transport or cars available through sharing or service models, rather than the private vehicle fleet.

Overall, the Commission could give far more attention to how the sharing economy could transform our transport system. The Commission discusses leasing and car share schemes once in the report, where it states that such schemes should be "targeted at low income communities... to help address barriers to access" (p.108). We agree that sharing and service models are a good way of increasing access to EVs, but affordable sharing and leasing schemes should become the norm for everyone - we do not believe that high and middle income earners should expect to continue owning their own car simply because they can afford it. We need to see a shift away from private car ownership because this is a wasteful use of finite resources and because cars have enormous amounts of embodied energy that makes them extremely inefficient as a commonly-owned private asset.

We are very disappointed by the approach to domestic aviation in the draft advice. The Commission's overall approach of focusing on adopting lower emissions technologies/decarbonisation rather reduced production (p.45) has backed it into a corner when it comes to addressing domestic flights given, as the commission notes, that decarbonising aviation is difficult. The only pathway to meaningful emissions reductions in aviation is to encourage people to fly less – the reference to sustainable aviation fuels in Necessary Action 4 is a pipe dream and insufficient to address emissions from aviation. We urge the Commission to make express recommendations about the need to reduce frequent flying by improving intra-regional transport in New Zealand, specifically coaches and passenger rail. At present, these forms of transport are either:

- unaffordable
- inconvenient
- uncomfortable
- targeted at tourists and holiday-makers rather than commuters, or
- all of the above.

Professor Shaun Hendy's publication #NoFly provides a useful summary of how these services in New Zealand currently do not offer a realistic alternative to flying for most people (Shaun Hendy (2019) #NoFly: Walking the talk on climate change (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books). Many of Professor Hendy's anecdotes about these services were very relatable to us, and could be considered satirical if it weren't so depressing. Investment is needed to improve transport infrastructure. However, measures such as subsidising bus and train ticket costs and levies on flying would also help to level the playing field between flying and land-based transport.

Do you want to continue with the consultation questions or would you like to end your submission here?

I would like to end my submission here