

# Global Context for Climate Action

As detailed in the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report,<sup>1</sup> even if anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions were stopped, the impacts of human activities would continue to be felt for centuries. These effects are likely to be felt on every continent and in every ocean. By missing our 2020 GHG reduction target, BC is contributing to the global failure to meet the Paris' Agreement's goal of keeping warming to well below 2 degrees. This will further climate destabilization and increase the likelihood of abrupt and irreversible changes.

Canada's first Nationally Determined Contribution, submitted as our national commitment to the agreed to goal in the Paris Accord, relies on a number of measures, principally the Pan Canadian Framework on Clean Growth and Climate Change<sup>2</sup>. The primary mechanism for the Framework is an insufficient carbon tax. The Framework does not attempt to tackle transformative changes necessary for decarbonization, set goals beyond 2030, or utilize supply side options for regulations. Independent analysis has concluded that this plan is not sufficient for Canada to meet its targets<sup>3</sup>, and it simply contributes to a global failure to meet the goals of the Paris Accord. This supports the conclusion that the federal plan is insufficient and provinces must go significantly beyond the baseline that the Pan Canadian Framework lays out in order to make up for this deficiency..

Our world needs to move swiftly to build a future that grows and protects carbon sinks, does not put anthropogenic greenhouse gases into the air, and is based in renewable commodities and power sources, not fossil fuels and other non-renewable resources. BC is well placed to be a leader in these areas, but we are not currently demonstrating any such leadership. We must develop and protect our carbon sinks such as forests and green spaces in cities, while aggressively transitioning every aspect of our collective lives away from fossil fuel usage. Instead we are locking ourselves into continued and prolonged fossil fuel usage, and by failing to put a significant and effective halt to the oil and gas industry, we are locking our global economy and society into a climate unstable future.

## BC's new plan for Climate Action - Clean Growth

The intention papers and process do not capture or reflect the urgency of our time. They do not adequately address the challenges ahead, nor BC's failures to reach goals set out by previous

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/syr/AR5\\_SYR\\_FINAL\\_SPM.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/syr/AR5_SYR_FINAL_SPM.pdf)

<sup>2</sup>

<http://www4.unfccc.int/ndcregistry/PublishedDocuments/Canada%20First/Canada%20First%20NDC-Revised%20submission%202017-05-11.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://climateactiontracker.org/countries/canada/>

governments. At best, these papers elaborate a plan for half-heartedly fighting climate change, not for winning against it. We are in a climate crisis, and this moment demands more from BC's climate strategy - it demands courageous leadership that looks beyond short time and questionable gain.

This plan does not acknowledge the Paris Accord, and does not lay a foundation for further decarbonizing work after 2050. It implies that we are done at that stage, instead of at the beginning of a new era beyond fossil fuels. This plan also does not capture the transformative changes that must occur in BC and across the country, and have already started across the globe. According to the Paris Accord, decarbonization is the ultimate goal, and so zero use of fossil fuels must be our ultimate objective. These papers fail to include the importance of decarbonization.

British Columbia has, in the past, been a leader in supporting emission reducing action. We brought in a carbon tax, decarbonized government operations, and ensured that BC Hydro did not expand its use of fossil fuel energy sources<sup>4</sup>. Arguably much of the low hanging fruit has been captured, and opportunities for emissions reductions that exist in other provinces are no longer present in BC. Our next steps must be transformative in ways that other jurisdictions are not yet prepared for.

However, this plan does not provide any new thinking or innovative ideas. Most of the tactics contained in it were put forward in the B.C. Climate Action Team's 2008 report<sup>5</sup>. We understandably expected further measures to represent the technological advancements that have been made locally and globally - but none were there. A plan that is more of the same represents a scaling back in ambition, and the turning of a blind eye to lessons learned through governing in the last decade.

This plan does not seem sufficient to get us to BC's own emission reducing goals. We know already that we will be missing our 2020 targets<sup>6</sup>. This plan does not represent a correction of the issues that caused us to miss that target. Previous governments were able to stall on taking meaningful action, and subsequent ones may as well. Any effective climate plan will face sectoral and interest group challenges, and therefore requires clear lines of responsibility and accountability. This plan does not provide a path to prevent repeating the process for our 2030 target. No options for course correction or penalties for those responsible for lack of action is present in the papers which is a serious weakness.

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.bchydro.com/news/conservation/2009/burrard\\_thermal\\_direction.html](https://www.bchydro.com/news/conservation/2009/burrard_thermal_direction.html)

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.bcsea.org/sites/bcsea.org/files/Climate\\_Action\\_Team\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](https://www.bcsea.org/sites/bcsea.org/files/Climate_Action_Team_Final_Report.pdf)

<sup>6</sup>

<https://globalnews.ca/news/4193252/b-c-government-misses-climate-targets-due-to-previous-government-stalling/>

If this public engagement process is the model for future engagement alluded to in the plan, then it will be a failure. Asking for feedback on vague plans without emissions modelling data indicates a lack of desire to have a substantive conversation. Asking input from British Columbians during the summer months communicates a lack of taking the public seriously. Ministry of Environment staff have admitted that this timing, and shortened time frame, have not been ideal. This process inspires little hope that public comments will be meaningfully integrated into the climate strategy.

## Feedback on the intentions papers from Georgia Strait Alliance

The first intentions papers to be released cover the three biggest sources of greenhouse gases<sup>7</sup>, but that is where their connection to the collected data appears to end. The papers each list a number of small and nested goals (such as having 5% of new vehicle sales being ZEVs) which are not elaborated upon. The papers are highly discretionary and don't confirm that any of the suggested measures will actually be implemented. The impact of achieving these goals, if they were committed to, is not predicted, or tied back to the sector's greenhouse gas emissions, nor is there any elaboration on how these goals might work with each other to add up to the overall goals and targets. They fail to elaborate on how the tactics in the intentions papers relate to targets. There is very little evidence of mid-range planning or thinking throughout any of the papers, despite the graphics in the introduction. There is clearly a gaping chasm between the activities chosen and the overall targets.

The papers do not acknowledge the missed 2020 target, eliminating the possibility of drawing lessons from the process and decisions that led us to miss this target. It does not provide a roadmap for preventing the missing of future targets. The process description does not elaborate on how the different topics for discussion and timeframes were selected, nor how they integrate. It also fails to explain how feedback from British Columbians will be incorporated and reported back on.

They fail to mention complete lifecycle considerations of products, energy sources, or sectors. In a global and connected world, our local emissions carry global impacts, and emissions from global sources impact us locally. If our strategy does not recognize the importance of decarbonizing entire supply chains, or only requires rigorous measurement and accounting for a few aspects of the lifecycle of a product, then we are likely to only promote increasing leakages of carbon. Along in this vein, the papers only discuss collaborating with the Federal Government, but not other provinces, municipal governments, First Nations communities, or our American neighbours.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/climate-change/data/provincial-inventory>

Industry as a whole has been isolated into one paper. This is a lost opportunity. Accountability and clean industrial forums or clubs may be formed under more sector specific policies to encourage collaboration and innovation within similar business models. This organization of process also fails to acknowledge that we must stop the extraction of fossil fuels, and that by 2050 the fossil fuel sector of the economy must have been phased out. This phasing out must include finding employment for the workers in that sector, and the facilities must be decontaminated and safely retrofitted to avoid further harm to the environment.

The papers paint very rosy imagery of our ability to reliably capture, account for, and report on our emissions. They do not mention gaps in reporting, such as the challenges in capturing fugitive emissions reliably, or leakages of emissions through other jurisdictions. They also do not mention enforcement or penalties for those found to be misrepresenting their emissions, or inspection of data to make sure that the data presented is as accurate as possible.

The plan and measures are also not based in the reality of municipal governance. The buildings paper lifts up Vancouver as an example of what can be done, and what good governance is for municipalities. Vancouver, because of the Vancouver Charter, is able to govern itself and support innovation in the built environment, in ways that other municipalities cannot. They also largely leave out punishing or restrictive measures for actors who do not contribute to a renewable and fossil free future.

Finally, the papers only discuss the connection between climate action and the economy. The papers also miss several important connections such as those to health care and social services, neighbourhood planning and design, community engagement, and education - all as potential climate solutions. They are silent on climate and ecosystems, and on our global passing of planetary boundaries<sup>8</sup>. We know that irreversible changes to our climate will create conditions that are unknown to us now, and that will drastically impact all of our ways of living. We are on the verge of several points of no return, and our previous estimates of the importance of these may have been conservative<sup>9</sup>.

## Transportation Paper

From reading the Transportation paper, one would be led to believe that all of our attention must be on personal transport, and one graph, on page 2 of the paper, in particular implies that personal and commercial transport are equal shares of our provincial emissions. However, it is clear from the BC Greenhouse Gas Inventory in table form that that is not the case - commercial

---

8

<http://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/planetary-boundaries/planetary-boundaries/about-the-research/the-nine-planetary-boundaries.html>

9

<https://www.sciencealert.com/international-climate-change-reports-tend-toward-caution-and-are-dangerously-misleading-says-new-report>

transport far outweighs personal (25 to 14% of CO<sub>2</sub>e in 2015)<sup>10</sup>. It is unclear why the lumping together of modes and types of transportation has been done, as the solutions and effective mechanisms to reduce greenhouse gases from commercial transportation choices are distinct from those that will reduce personal transportation emissions. Further, the transportation paper is unclear around what level of reductions are expected from this sector.

It is disappointing that the goods transportation system is not being considered more thoroughly in this paper. The paper lists a few ideas for reducing emissions from commercial transport, but uses incredibly discretionary language, and does not commit to or discuss any options for action. Given that commercial transport is BC's largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, we expected to see the most drastic changes from this sector. The paper fails to explain why we aren't being more aggressive and innovative.

The paper seems to depend upon providing shore power to ships as a means to reduce emissions from cargo. This is a very tenuous notion to place all of our faith for decarbonization of cargo as it only displaces a short period of the fuel usage by ships, and ships from international routes may not be compatible with the connections offered by our ports. Eliminating emissions from commercial transport and cargo will require more than simply electrifying ports. Improved supply chain management and changes in how ships travel is managed in BC waters are two examples. Aside from a cursory mention of expanding the specialty use vehicle program, the paper does not address the challenges with tackling an entire multi-modal chain of transportation and the transition of goods between shipment methods.

Railways are mentioned in a cursory fashion as being a more desirable means of transporting goods but there is no analysis or data to justify this claim. BC's railway corridors are not electrified, and still rely upon fossil fuel driven engines for the propulsion along the entire corridor. We need a plan to eliminate the emissions associated with this mode of goods transport if we are to increase its use. We also need to consider the interactions between this type of shipment and other transportation corridors such as passenger travel by rail, marine shipments, and railway crossings of other modes such as cycling routes or roadways. The plan may start by electrifying the port end of the railways, but must be expanded from there.

For personal transportation the initial goal is to have ZEVs make up 5% of all new light-duty vehicle sales, but that number is not justified in the context of an emissions goal. No explanation is given as to why incentives would be phased out once the 5% goal is achieved, what ZEVs baseline market share is now, and what emissions reductions would be expected as a result of reaching the goal. The goal does not include any penalties for suppliers who do not contribute to meeting the 5% benchmark, nor delineate the expectation or responsibilities for each dealer or manufacturer. The paper also provides no support for the transition of fleets of light-duty vehicles moving over to ZEVs, a significant oversight given Vancouver's status as a car-sharing

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/climate-change/data/provincial-inventory>

hub<sup>11</sup>. The paper doesn't discuss the needed infrastructure to support use of ZEVs, including charging stations in dedicated parking spots - so that the chargers are accessible to the vehicles that actually need them instead of taken up by fossil fuel driven vehicles.

Public Transit is given a cursory mention, but decarbonization is not centered. Without making centering decarbonization of the whole system the goal, there is no guarantee that an increase in transit availability will decrease emissions from personal transportation. Poorly planned transit infrastructure that uses fossil fuels, or transit that displaces cycling or pedestrian trips, may lead to a net increase in emissions per travelled kilometer. The example of Victoria's electric bus is highlighted, but no detail is provided for the expansion of that type of vehicle across BC's transit systems. There is no actionable plans for other jurisdictions to adopt the technology, or metrics for them to judge if it might be appropriate for their communities.

Community planning and travel demand management plans are given a cursory mention but leadership and accountability are not made clear. The paper misses the opportunity to have an in depth discussion as to why people choose to travel in the ways that they do. This leaves out the opportunity for the province to engage both in small scale and in regional travel demand management, by supporting both community planning and regional networks with mobility in mind. Included in this concept is the possibility for pedestrian only zones, and reduced speed areas in pedestrian heavy areas, such as downtown cores, residential neighbourhoods, or around community amenities. The success of these plans in promoting any one type of modal choice or trip length and purpose will depend at least partially on who may hold the power to engage with the plans. Translink already has a travel demand management plan<sup>12</sup>, but the structure of Metro Vancouver gives Translink the ability to engage with community planning, other modes of travel, and departments within the region. BC Transit will need increased capacity and support to be able to engage with other major regions and municipalities in the rest of the province to the same level. BC Transit will also face the challenge of non-urban transport, and promotion of non-car trips in regions with significantly longer distances to travel.

The reliance of the climate strategy on a low carbon fuel standard is shortsighted and problematic. The paper does not mention any intention to conduct lifecycle analysis on the choice or incentives of renewable fuels. Just because a fuel emits less carbon at the tail pipe does not mean that its total emissions are reduced as compared to other fuels. Natural gas from hydraulic fracturing, as an example, has a very different greenhouse gas emissions profile than does Biogas from agricultural waste. The entire lifecycle must be accounted for, and be visible to consumers as well as in the provincial greenhouse gas inventory. Further, the use of a low carbon fuel standard locks us into a certain amount of fossil fuel usage. Even requiring 20% of a fuel to be from renewable sources means that 80% of that fuel is from fossil sources. This will lock part of the fleet currently on our roads into fossil fuel use, which does not align with our reduction goals or ultimately having zero emissions across the province.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/vancouver-car-share-car2go-evo-1.4504926>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.translink.ca/Rider-Guide/TravelSmart.aspx>

Air Travel is completely absent from the discussion, despite the fact that domestic travel is a significant contributor to our current travel emissions. BC has domestic aviation which is clearly within the jurisdiction of the province, and it will need to be tackled.

## Buildings Paper

In reading the buildings paper, one would expect that there are significant emissions reductions gains to be made in the built environment. However, Residential and Commercial aspects of the built environment only take up 6% and 7% of our greenhouse gas inventory, respectively, from 2015<sup>13</sup>. So why this sector has received as much attention as it has, without a discussion around its potential to catalyze other sectors making reductions, seems shortsighted. It is also unclear as to what the emissions reduction goal is in this sector.

The paper implies that addressing and reducing greenhouse gas intensity must be done at local and community levels, and highlights Vancouver as an example of a community that has been successful. Once again, the discussion fails to recognize Vancouver's unique ability to support transition given to it in the Vancouver Charter<sup>14</sup>. Other communities are regulated by provincial building codes<sup>15</sup>, and therefore are not able to offer the tailored support that Vancouver is able to offer to its green building and renewables sectors.

Focusing on energy efficiency without looking at greenhouse gas intensity may lock us into a building stock that depends on fossil fuel heating sources and is unprepared to produce and capture their own energy. We need instead to transition our built environment fundamentally. This means addressing the increased structural requirements of buildings to support adding electricity generation technology, such as solar panels for water heating or electricity generation.

The paper mentions limited amounts of collaboration with businesses and building owners to support ZEV charging stations, but not with planning or municipal departments to provide support and infrastructure for their benefit, or with individual land owners. The paper fails to support residential or municipally-driven installation of charging stations

We are uncomfortable with the idea that an operation can use carbon offsets to compensate for its core business operations. Offsetting carbon emissions has several weaknesses, including an asymmetry in information between buyer and seller which may inflate their cost or value<sup>16</sup>, or that offsets being sold do not represent real and permanent reductions in greenhouse gas

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/climate-change/data/provincial-inventory>

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/vanch\\_10#section305](http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/vanch_10#section305).

<sup>15</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/construction-industry/building-codes-standards/building-act>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0095069613000193>

emissions<sup>17</sup>. Offsets should be counted for a limited maximum percentage of each operation's greenhouse gas, and only for those industries whose core operations are themselves renewable and in line with the emissions reduction goals. They must also be eliminated over the course of a facility making the transition to renewable energy.

In keeping with the blindspot around lifecycle analysis, the paper fails to address material choices and the greenhouse gases already emitted by materials during their production phase. There is no incentive for industries supplying buildings to decarbonize their operations and products. Any work done directly in the built environment risks being undermined by the industries supplying the products. The papers also fail to deal with waste heat from industry, and the technologies of cogeneration as a supply of cleaner energy for buildings.

The paper continues to concentrate the decision making power over energy use in built environments in the hands of landowners, missing an opportunity to empower tenants. The paper does mention communication of energy use to renters at the time of a lease signing, but does not empower renters to use or develop their skills to decarbonize their residence. This is particularly pertinent for this government as they seek to increase the supply of affordable rental units<sup>18</sup>.

## Clean Growth Paper

It is unclear why all industries have been lumped together under one paper and strategy. The lack of connection to the greenhouse gas inventory was particularly prominent in this paper. The support for a sector such as forestry making the transition to fossil free operations will require a different approach than the support required to manage the decline and shutdown of the fossil fuel sector. It is unclear as to what the emissions reductions goals are for this "sector." The lack of granularity around strategy, accounting and measures here is concerning.

The paper emphasises low carbon energy, without addressing the actual need to move to fossil fuel free energy. Our goal must be to fully decarbonize our economy, and to remove fossil fuels from all aspects of our lives. This strategy needs to deal with the reality of stopping extraction of fossil fuels, and integrating those workers into other aspects of the economy. It is also unclear how this supports operations prioritizing transitioning operations away from emissions-intensive energy and processes now. The buildings paper discussed the need for training options to move skilled workers away from fossil based industries, but does not connect to the clean growth paper or provide a path for supporting the creation of permanent renewable economy positions once training programs and apprenticeship programs are complete.

The paper did not discuss the exemptions in the current carbon tax scheme<sup>19</sup>, and plans to close them. There were numerous subsidies and exemptions that were dolled out under the

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.nrdc.org/stories/should-you-buy-carbon-offsets>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.bchousing.org/news?newsId=1479151291134>

<sup>19</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/taxes/sales-taxes/motor-fuel-carbon-tax/business/exemptions>



previous political regime that can be cut out to effectively remove incentives to emit carbon at unsustainable rates. For example, the Greenhouse Carbon Tax Relief Grant<sup>20</sup>, the exemptions for fuel being emitted on interprovincial vessels (such as rail or cruise ships) even if it is being emitted within BC<sup>21</sup>, and other fossil fuel subsidies such as the deep drilling credit, and the marginal well royalty reduction program<sup>22</sup>.

This paper fails to indicate how industries that don't fit into the future targets will be refused entry into BC's economy. There are numerous fossil fuel extraction proposals, for example, across BC, which cannot fit into a climate plan that is bounded by the Paris Accord. This paper fails to mention how we will choose to invest not just in prolonging the life of old industries that should have had their taps turned off a decade ago, but to actively prioritize building a renewable future. On a global scale - to be efficient is not a good metric. The proposed industrial fund may go entirely to operations who should be shutting down due to the absolute level of their emissions, where instead it could go to supporting operations that can make meaningful change. Given the choice between building a sustainable future now, and investing in old industries that will displace newer ones for a time, we must choose future building. The path forward is to transition now, not to give exemptions to industries that shouldn't be operating at all. BC should not compete to be the best at making bad practices slightly better, we should compete for leading into a fossil free future.

## Recommendations from Georgia Strait Alliance

Georgia Strait Alliance has several recommendations for improvements to the provincial climate strategy and associated legislation. We submit these in good faith, with the goal that you implement the most effective strategy possible that cannot be undone easily by any subsequent actors before the 2030, 2040 and 2050 targets are reached.

## Recognition of Transformative Change Required

The climate strategy must acknowledge that we need to make transformative changes to the way that our economy and lives function. We need to stop the expansion of fossil fuel industries, stop the extraction of new fossil fuels, transition workers and communities away from dependence on fossil resources, and support a national transition away from fossil fuels by halting their transport across our province.

---

<sup>20</sup>

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/programs/greenhouse-carbon-tax-relief-grant>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/taxes/sales-taxes/motor-fuel-carbon-tax/business/exemptions>

<sup>22</sup> <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/natural-gas-oil/oil-gas-royalties/royalties-royalty-programs>

In order for our planet to remain livable for humans, our daily actions and economy will need to be different than the status quo. Making this transformative change may incur direct costs now, but will provide immeasurable value to future generations. The forest fires, flooding, and global heat waves this summer are the tip of the iceberg in terms of what kind of events we can expect to become much more probable in the coming decades. We must build a fossil free future, investing in infrastructure, making climate-stabilizing economic choices, and ensuring that even the most vulnerable among us have safe place to go.

## Climate Accountability

The new strategy does not improve upon the lack of accountability from the last targets. If nobody is assigned responsibility for meeting targets, then we are likely to see another missed target in 2030, and then 2040 and again in 2050. Responsibility for each sector's target needs to be delineated, and then those responsible must be held accountable. Voluntary and discretionary programs don't cause market shifts in the time frame that is needed. This accountability could take the form of a reward or bonus for those who meet their targets, or a salary docking for ministers responsible for sectors who aren't able to achieve their required reductions. A part of accountability must be increasing transparency and putting in place an independent climate watchdog to publish interim reports at the midpoint and endpoint between targets. These reports would include analysis of the achievements of the programs, to bring to light failings, and to guide the actions towards meeting our targets.

## Carbon Budgets

The communication and language of targets is inherently difficult to grasp for individuals and companies. Percentage reductions of greenhouse gases over decades, from a baseline decades ago are not an effective form of communicating goals. We would never have such vague language in a financial budget. Targets must be translated into megatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e, so that individuals and sectors can understand the goal, and reasonably measure their own actions against achieving that collective goal. The targets must also then be broken into a maximum of 5 year increments to better align with financial and political cycles and increase the salience of the timeframe that changes must be made on.

The papers, as written, present a high level goal and then a handful of tactics that might be employed on our way there, but fail to elaborate mid- to long-term plans. Communicating the emissions reductions as incremental carbon budgets will lend itself more readily to actionable planning.

The strategy must, in a clear, transparent, and consistent way, account for the entire lifecycle of fuels and materials. For example, a fuel choice must be able to be made considering all the processing and carbon in extraction. All fossil fuels must be clearly visible in the supply chain so

that individuals, groups, and companies can make informed decisions to move away from them and to actively choose renewables.

## Accountability of Fossil Fuel Producers

The passing of an accountability act, in a similar vein to BC's Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act<sup>23</sup> to give structure and guidance to the courts when groups and institutions seek damages from fossil fuel producers. This will help actors in BC hold actors in other jurisdictions accountable for damages incurred, and increase global competitiveness of renewable energy sources. There are a number of municipalities in BC who have begun the discussion around responsibility, accountability, and liability of fossil fuel producers to aid them with funds to adapt to the new climate they have curated. As municipalities grapple with the realities of adapting to a new climate reality, and seek damages from fossil fuel producers, these discussions are likely to end up in the courts. An act similar to the Cost Recovery Act will help ease the burden on the courts, and support municipal taxpayers by ensuring that the entire cost of adaptation does not fall to them.

New industries coming in may carry significant inherent emissions. An upstream and downstream climate test as part of Environmental Assessment reform would ensure that industries already in BC aren't unfairly punished by surprise additional reductions required because of the new industry on the block. This consideration would also extend to other sectors such as transportation and buildings, so that a new industry such as LNG, would not force all other emissions to stop abruptly in order for us to meet our targets.

## Collaboration

In order to ensure that we move our society away from catastrophic climate change, and towards a renewable future, we must integrate social issues into our climate solutions. If the only housing that promotes climate friendly communities is inaccessibly priced, then it will continue to perpetuate inequity and not be adopted widely as a solution. Cities and towns will need support to develop their own capacity around planning and fostering personal transportation choices. If skilled individuals can't retrofit their own homes to produce energy, and farmers can't tap into additional income from their lands and waste products, then our power grid will not be able to diversify and may be weak to pressures such as drought and aging infrastructure. If schools and childcare facilities aren't part of the discussion in planning or implementation of measures then an incredible opportunity to work for people on all fronts is lost.

The concentration of capital and decision making power into the hands of a few people and institutions that are disconnected from the reality of the majority of British Columbians has

---

<sup>23</sup> [http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/00\\_00030\\_01](http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/00_00030_01)

created both social issues as well as the struggle to meet our climate targets. Affordability will allow people to engage in more fulfilling and balanced, but also low carbon choices and lifestyles. The means with which we achieve this must not undermine reaching our climate targets. Our collective lives must be brought into a framing that not only acknowledges the human aspects of changes that need to be made, but also the ecological limits and opportunities.

## Conclusion

Our world needs to move swiftly to build a future that grows and protects carbon sinks, does not put anthropogenic greenhouse gases into the air, and is based in renewable commodities and power sources, not fossil fuels and other non-renewable resources. We know that failing to do so will drastically increase the probability of irreversible changes to our climate will create conditions that are unknown to us now.

Instead of taking action, we are continuing a pattern set by the previous political regime to lock ourselves into continued and prolonged fossil fuel usage. Excuses for why we cannot act boldly are simply locking our global economy and society into a climate unstable future. Ineffective implementation of a plan to halt our use of fossil fuels will only exacerbate the climate change we are already experiencing. Premier Horgan has stated that the summer wildfires are the 'new normal'; what is proposed in these papers seems to be an acceptance of this and an inability to stop the downturn.

BC is well placed to be a leader in taking climate action. We have beautiful carbon sinks that are an integral part of our identity and economy. We have the opportunity to begin aggressively transitioning every aspect of our collective lives away from fossil fuel usage. We can show leadership to the world by intertwining social, economic, and environmental progress. We must move together to connect climate action with public health and to acute health care, to build up social services and neighbourhood planning, to design liveable areas focused on community engagement, and to foster education. In leading by example, we will not only take responsibility for our own actions and impacts, but blaze a trail for others to make their own transitions. It can be done - we simply have to be willing.