Hi,

I am very concerned about the new heat pumps bringing in an additional round of refrigerant issues. The industry narrative (therefore the public one too) is that the benefits outweigh the risks – instead of the fact that there are other heat pumps with non toxic refrigerants - using CO2 – why isn’t the dialog; using a toxic virulent Ghg refrigerant VS using a known and cheap, functional non toxic refrigerant that is on the market? And where has solar hot water - used world wide as a low tech economical heating system disappeared to in this discussion –?

LEDs are ubiquitous despite extremely serious health, safety and environmental impacts. It has been 5 years since the AMA report on LEDs and many more on their environmental/safety impacts yet they are still being promoted unquestioningly by environmental groups. LEDs were allowed to become a default technology with scant regulation.

As a society we have never implemented a precautionary principal and that is one of the reasons I do not support things like 'climate emergency' resolutions or 100% electrification. Those both make for good slogans but in their wake do not promote safe, well researched and diverse solutions. It’s not ok to give industry carte blanche in the name of climate emergency or electrify everything and then open our public wallet for their exorbitant prices - to boot.

I think as environmentalists/ climate activists we need to be honest, speak up – and demand that the development of energy efficient technologies are held to a high standard of regulation and ‘do as little harm as possible’. At present another influx of harmful industrial technologies is being enabled and rubber stamped by climate and environmental groups all over the country - simply because they pass the energy efficient test. We need to be working to remove the type of artificial barriers that prevent low tech, non toxic, economical solutions – like hot water solar from being a viable option.

Thank you for all your work and listening to my concerns,

Rebekah Collins