

# Our Uncashed Dividend

The health  
benefits  
of climate  
action

A briefing paper  
prepared by the  
Climate and Health  
Alliance and  
The Climate Institute



CLIMATE  
AND  
HEALTH  
ALLIANCE



The  
Climate  
Institute

August 2012

---

Published by the Climate and Health Alliance [www.caha.org.au](http://www.caha.org.au) and The Climate Institute [www.climateinstitute.org.au](http://www.climateinstitute.org.au)

Written by Fiona Armstrong (CAHA)

**With thanks to**

Corey Watts, Tony McMichael, Elizabeth Haworth, Peter Tait, Stephan Lewandowsky, Marion Carey, Hugh Montgomery, Robin Stott, Susie Burke, Pendo Maro, Garry Egger, Erwin Jackson and John Connor.

ISBN 978-1-921611-26-1

---

---

# Contents

---

<b>Our Uncashed Dividend</b>	<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Energy sources matter to health</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>The health benefits of climate action</b>	<b>Clearing the air</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Changing the way we move</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Healthier homes and buildings</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>Protecting our ecosystems</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Eating our way to better health (and a safer climate)</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>Endnotes</b>	<b>26</b>

# Executive Summary

There are significant immediate health benefits and substantial economic savings possible from taking action on climate change.

This health ‘dividend’ is a significant but currently unrealised opportunity from action on climate change. To date, climate action has mainly been talked about as a cost when in fact there can be and are many benefits, including:

- Improvements in health and life expectancy
- Fewer days off work or with restricted activity
- Fewer medical consultations
- Fewer hospital admissions
- Reduced use of medication
- Increased productivity

Building support for climate action in Australia would be greatly assisted by a wider understanding of the significant improvements in human health possible from cutting emissions.

As things stand, these opportunities—and the economic, social and environmental rewards associated with them—are largely untapped here in Australia. Yet by reducing greenhouse gas emissions we can deliver immediate, and potentially large improvements in population health.

Moreover, if policies across the health, energy, transport, agriculture and housing sectors are designed to complement one another, the benefits are likely to be even greater.

Many of the biggest health care challenges today, and the greatest drains on the public purse, are preventable chronic diseases associated with carbon-intensive lifestyles.<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, it turns out that many of the most effective methods of reducing greenhouse gas emissions will also reduce the incidence of these diseases, bringing substantial improvements in public health and wellbeing.

Australian society is reliant on fossil fuels and it’s costing us billions annually. For example:

- Coal-fired power in Australia burdens the community with a human health cost—from lung, heart, and nervous system diseases—estimated at \$2.6 billion annually.<sup>2,3</sup>
- The annual health cost of pollution from cars, trucks and other modes of fossil-fuelled transport is estimated at around \$3.3 billion.<sup>4</sup> In Australia, air pollution is estimated to kill more people every year than the road toll.<sup>5</sup>

These conservative estimates suggest the shift to clean energy and transport could save the Australian community up to \$6 billion annually in avoided health costs. Studies overseas indicate the potential savings are even greater. Moreover, the available evidence suggests that the health benefits from cutting emissions could in part offset the cost of emission reductions.<sup>6,7,8</sup>

Aside from the economic benefits, strategies to reduce emissions can also reduce the incidence and severity of many debilitating chronic and avoidable diseases associated with our high-carbon lifestyles:

- Reducing the burning of fossil fuels for electricity and transport can reduce the incidence of heart and lung diseases, including lung cancer, as well as neurologic disorders.
- Improving the thermal efficiency of homes and commercial buildings can reduce emissions, improve air quality, and protect health.<sup>9</sup>
- Where alternatives are available, shifting from private cars to active forms of transport such as walking and cycling has the potential to substantially reduce obesity, lung disease, heart disease, breast cancer, and depression.<sup>10,11</sup>
- Moderating the amount of animal products in the average Australian diet can reduce the toll of heart disease and diet-related cancers.
- Protecting and restoring natural ecosystems helps keep carbon stored in the landscape, prevents the spread of disease,<sup>12</sup> and provides important psychological and mental health benefits.<sup>13</sup>

A failure to take effective action on climate change will continue to have significant effects on human health. However, it is possible to act effectively to prevent further harm from climate change, and doing so will reap many public health benefits. Current

approaches to climate policy in Australia fall far short of what is required to help prevent further climate change to protect health. While the recent introduction of federal legislation is a welcome beginning, a comprehensive and integrated set of policy measures across all sectors is needed.

The development of a national strategy for health in relation to climate change is needed to help manage the risks to people’s health and to promote health through emissions reductions. The public policy response should include the development of integrated strategies to reduce emissions and improve health across the energy, transport, housing, and food and agriculture and land use sectors.

Given both the tremendous health risks of a more hostile Australian climate and the substantial benefits of action, the development of a coordinated national approach should be prioritised. Such an approach would help communities, businesses and government better prepare for climate change, take advantage of the opportunities provided by low-carbon initiatives, and take actions that cut emissions and promote better human health.

The earlier emissions reduction strategies are implemented, the greater the health benefits. That is, cumulative savings and health gains will be greater if action begins now. Economic evaluation of the health benefits of emissions reductions in Australian jurisdictions would provide economic, social and political incentives for action and help build public support for climate mitigation.

# Introduction

In December 2011, representatives of more than thirty health organisations—the World Medical Association, the International Council of Nurses, and the World Federation of Public Health Associations amongst them—met in Durban, South Africa, alongside the United Nations climate change conference. They cited ‘strong evidence that action on climate change can deliver significant and immediate benefits to health’, and issued a Declaration calling on governments to:

“ Recognise the health benefits of climate mitigation and take bold and substantive action to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions in order to protect and promote public health. ”<sup>14</sup>



This statement follows years of research and a growing appreciation of the interconnectedness of health and climate change. It has been understood for some time that a warming world would spell, overall, a more hostile climate. Indeed, a 2009 report prepared jointly by prestigious British medical journal *The Lancet* and University College London put it bluntly:

“ Climate change is the biggest global health threat of the 21st century. Effects of climate change on health will affect most populations in the next decades and put the lives and wellbeing of billions of people at increased risk. ”<sup>15</sup>

Climate change is already contributing to increasing public health problems: injuries and deaths associated with more extreme weather events such as fires, storms and droughts; worsening of chronic illnesses; the spread of infectious diseases; deteriorating water and food quality and availability; declining air quality; and the displacement of populations—all will impact on human health and well-being.<sup>16</sup>

The ongoing impacts on public health will depend greatly on the population in question and on the extent of mitigation. In general, it is world’s poor who will suffer most. In Australia, the elderly, the very young, and rural and regional communities—including Indigenous Australians—are particularly vulnerable.<sup>17</sup>

Less well known, however, are the documented health benefits from actions that reduce carbon pollution: smarter transport, healthier diets, more efficient home heating, switching to clean power.

These have recently been the subject of study by the health care community, although the research is yet to percolate into the mainstream media and policy discussion, and more work is needed in Australia.

To date, action on climate change has largely been communicated in the language of sacrifice, loss, and disadvantage. Where significant public health co-benefits can be demonstrated, however, communities may be more inclined to accept mitigation strategies, regardless of people’s appreciation for the risks of climate change itself.

This document reviews the expert literature on health, pollution reduction strategies, and climate change. It has been prepared for journalists, policy-makers, and the public; to raise awareness of the health co-benefits from climate action; and to encourage support for a better understanding of the potential benefits for Australians.

# Energy sources matter to health

Fossil fuels play a dominant role in Australia's energy supply, which is currently one of the most emissions-intensive and inefficient in the world.<sup>18</sup> In particular, a heavy reliance on coal, which supplies almost 80 per cent of Australia's electricity, has direct and immediate consequences for human health.<sup>19</sup>

The mining and combustion of coal carries serious and well understood risks for human health, including diseases such as asthma, lung cancer, heart disease, and stroke.<sup>20,21</sup>

Pollution from coal power also affects lung development, increases the risk of heart attacks, and can impair intellectual development.<sup>22</sup> Coal mining is associated

with cardiovascular, lung and kidney diseases,<sup>23</sup> including pneumoconiosis ('black lung') which causes permanent scarring of lungs in coal miners.<sup>24</sup>


Researchers estimate that coal-fired power generation in Australia carries a human health cost—from associated respiratory, cardiovascular, and nervous system diseases—of A\$2.6 billion annually.<sup>25,26</sup>

Coal mining comes with some significant occupational hazards: coal miners die in greater numbers and suffer more lost time from injuries than all other miners.<sup>27</sup> In comparison, renewable energy systems have fewer and lower occupational health risks than coal and nuclear.<sup>28</sup>

# \$2.6 billion

Researchers estimate that coal-fired power generation in Australia carries a human health cost—from associated respiratory, cardiovascular, and nervous system diseases—of A\$2.6 billion annually.

## The hidden costs of electricity





## HEALTH BENEFITS OF CLEAN RENEWABLE ENERGY

Research published in the *The Lancet* in 2009 found thousands of lives could be saved from shifting to cleaner energy generation.<sup>29</sup> The burning of fossil fuels—coal, petrol, diesel—releases tiny particles into the air which, when inhaled, increase the risk of cardiopulmonary (i.e. heart and lung disease), including lung cancer. Switching to cleaner power sources reduces this risk substantially.<sup>30</sup>

Modelling of potential changes in the energy mix in Europe shows that a two-thirds reduction in greenhouse gas emissions could save almost 50,000 lives each year; lives that would otherwise be lost owing to air pollution.<sup>31</sup>

*The Acting Now for Better Health* report from Health Care Without Harm and the Health and Environment Alliance evaluated the local health co-benefits of implementing strategies in Europe in 2010 to achieve 30 per cent by 2020 emissions reduction target. This report found implementing strategies to achieve this target would save the EU more than €82 billion (A\$100 billion) each year by 2020 from avoided ill-health and productivity gains.<sup>32</sup> The same study shows that early action yields bigger gains, with benefits 250 per cent higher if action is taken immediately.

## BLACK CARBON

The health benefits of cutting emissions by shifting to cleaner energy sources are even greater for people in developing nations. For example, almost three billion people in developing nations currently rely on the burning of biomass (mostly wood) and coal for heating and cooking.<sup>33</sup> The pollution\* this creates is a significant contributor to climate change and is also responsible for more than one-third of the annual deaths worldwide from chronic lung disease,

causing the deaths of two million people annually from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, lung cancer and pneumonia.<sup>34</sup>

The 'soot' produced from burning biofuels indoors such as wood, dung and crop residue is known as 'black carbon'. Black carbon is also produced from burning fossil fuels (such as coal and diesel) and biomass burning (associated with deforestation and burning of crop residues). Emissions of black

carbon are the second strongest contribution to current global warming, after carbon dioxide emissions).<sup>35</sup>

Reducing the reliance of people in developing nations on wood and coal through the provision of clean renewable energy technologies has the potential to substantially improve health and dramatically reduce global greenhouse gas emissions,<sup>36</sup> and other global warming pollutants such as black carbon.<sup>37</sup>

# Clearing the air



Cutting emissions in the energy and transport sectors not only has the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but can also deliver improvements in public health from improved air quality.<sup>38</sup>

Globally, air pollution kills 1.34 million people each year.<sup>40</sup> In Australia, it is estimated that more people are killed by air pollution every year than the road toll.<sup>41</sup> The 2012 OECD Environmental Outlook report suggests that without policy action, air pollution will become the biggest cause of environmentally-related deaths worldwide by 2050.<sup>42</sup>

## COAL AND HEALTH


History provides a guide to the links between air pollution and health: the sudden reduction in air pollution following a ban on burning coal in Ireland in the 1990s was associated with marked and dramatic improvements in respiratory health.<sup>39</sup>

## TRAFFIC AND AIR POLLUTION

Motor vehicle-related air pollution is believed to be responsible for between 900 and 4,500 cases of cardiovascular and respiratory diseases and bronchitis each year in Australia, and between 900 and 2,000 early deaths.<sup>45</sup>

Reducing air pollution through strategies to cut greenhouse gas emissions has the potential to significantly reduce the associated incidence of cardiovascular and respiratory disease, bronchitis, and asthma. This would prevent hospital admissions and visits to doctors, as well as reducing time lost from school and work.<sup>43,44</sup>

# Benefits of reducing CO<sup>2</sup>



There are considerable savings for Europe from emissions reductions, largely from reduced air pollution, that are outlined in the report *Acting Now for Better Health*. This report estimates the European Union could save more than €80 billion each year by 2020 from implementing emissions reductions of 30 per cent by 2020.<sup>46</sup> These benefits resulted from reduced particulate matter (PM), sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) associated with reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from energy and transport.<sup>47</sup>

A more recent American review of the economic value of the health co-benefits accrued through improved air quality suggests an average benefit of US\$49 (A\$46) per tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> avoided.<sup>48</sup>

Studies reveal that even a modest reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of (10–20 per cent) would lead to air quality improvements that would avoid thousands of deaths in developed nations like Australia, as well as tens of thousands of avoided deaths in developing countries.<sup>49</sup>

The Netherlands Environment Agency estimated in 2009 that reducing emissions of greenhouse gases to half of 2005 levels would reduce the number of premature deaths in 2050 from air pollution by 20–40 per cent.<sup>50</sup>

These health gains are likely to increase substantially with larger emissions reductions, with bigger cuts in emissions associated with delivering greater improvements in health.<sup>51</sup>

In addition to emitting carbon dioxide, energy and transport systems are responsible for the production of other, shorter-lived, greenhouse pollutants such as

black carbon and ground-level ozone. All are associated with poor respiratory health and also contribute to global warming.<sup>53</sup>

Rising temperatures from global warming are contributing to increasing levels of ground-level ozone pollution, formed when sunlight and the chemicals (found in motor vehicle exhaust) react with one another.<sup>54</sup> Ozone damages the airways and lungs, causing inflammation and reduced function. Exposure to increased levels of ozone is associated with increased hospital admissions for pneumonia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, and other respiratory diseases—all with reduced life expectancy and fulfilment.<sup>55</sup>



Simply shifting to stricter emissions standards for non-road diesel engines being used in the construction and industrial sectors in Australia could reduce particle emissions by more than 10,000 tonnes each year and deliver associated health benefits (from reduced PM10 and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions),

**saving taxpayers up to \$5 billion annually.**<sup>52</sup>

In Australian cities like Melbourne and Sydney, ozone levels exceed the national standard several times a year.<sup>56</sup> While the health and economic costs of ozone pollution in Australia have not been evaluated, a 2011 study by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) suggested that ozone will cost the United States US\$5.4 billion (\$A5.5 billion) each year by 2020, causing almost three million additional acute respiratory attacks.<sup>57</sup>

Reducing emissions from transport can have a powerful effect on health: a road transport reduction strategy implemented for the summer Olympics in Atlanta in 1996 led to a 22.5 per cent reduction in weekday peak traffic, and a corresponding decline in concentrations of carbon monoxide, particulates and nitrogen dioxide, as well as a drop of almost 30 per cent in ozone levels.<sup>58</sup> There was also a lower rate of acute childhood asthma attacks during the period.<sup>59</sup>

# Changing the way we move



In Australia, annual health costs from pollution from fossil-fuelled transport are estimated to be around \$3.3 billion.<sup>62</sup> Emissions from transport are the country's third largest source of emissions and second fastest growing source, with emissions expected to rise 64 per cent between 1990 and 2020.<sup>63</sup>

Globally, 3.2 million deaths each year can be attributed to physical inactivity.<sup>64</sup> It is estimated that the UK National Health Service (NHS) spends \$US5,000 per minute treating diseases that could be prevented by regular physical activity.<sup>65</sup> Longitudinal studies reveal cycling for transport is associated with 30-40% lower mortality

Direct and immediate health gains are possible from changes to our approach to land transport. Reducing our reliance on private vehicles through investment in improved public transport and increasing the proportion of trips taken by active transport such as walking and cycling offer substantial opportunities to improve health.

These include:

- reduced incidence of chronic diseases, in particular respiratory and cardiovascular diseases;
- obesity, from increased physical activity
- reduced illnesses and deaths as a result of declining air pollution; and
- reduced road injuries and deaths.<sup>60,61</sup>

Switching to active transport to achieve emissions reductions can provide considerable health benefits, with reductions in risk of ischaemic heart disease; cerebrovascular disease/stroke; breast cancer; dementia; and depression.

## THE COSTS OF OBESITY

Obesity has now overtaken smoking as the leading cause of premature death and illness in Australia.<sup>70</sup> More than 60 per cent of Australian adults are overweight or obese.<sup>71</sup> Obesity leads to higher rates of diabetes and heart disease, and can lead to reproductive disorders, some cancers and osteoarthritis.<sup>72</sup> The health problems created by excess weight cause a burden for individuals, families and communities. The direct health costs of obesity to the Australian community are estimated to be more than \$8 billion a year.<sup>73</sup> The overall cost to Australian society and governments of lost wellbeing associated of obesity is estimated at more than \$58 billion a year.<sup>74</sup>

rates,<sup>66</sup> and cycling and walking projects provide high value for money, with the health gains returning a benefit:cost ratio of 5:1.<sup>67</sup>

The likelihood of becoming obese increases by 6 per cent for each hour spent in a car each day.<sup>68</sup> Conversely, it is possible to reduce these odds by 5 per cent simply by walking an additional kilometre each day.<sup>69</sup> Relatively simple, cheap initiatives like this can yield profound improvements in health, cutting emissions at the same time.

Investing in active forms of transport such as walking and cycling as well as public transport also offers economic benefits by reducing the need to invest in costly road infrastructure and protecting against future shocks from price rises and interruptions to fuel supplies.<sup>75</sup> Communities that are designed to facilitate active and public transport can reduce household costs,<sup>76</sup> reduce social isolation and improve social capital by improving community connectedness as well as improve health and wellbeing.<sup>77</sup>

10-19%

Reduction of ischaemic heart disease



10-18%

Reduction of cerebrovascular disease/stroke

12-13%

Reduction of breast cancer



4-6%

Reduction of depression

7-8%

Reduction of dementia



These strategies can bring further improvements in health and emissions reductions if an integrated policy approach is adopted, in which transport reform is accompanied by changes to planning and land use, making it possible for people to live and work more closely.<sup>79</sup>


Planning laws that make cities more accessible by providing walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure improve both health and equity as this can improve access to services and enhance safety for people without other forms of transport such as women, older adults and children.<sup>80</sup> There are demonstrable mental health benefits associated with the increased community connectedness and reduced social isolation from improved access to active transport.<sup>81</sup> While there is potential for increases in injuries associated with increased walking and cycling, concurrent improvements in active transport infrastructure and practices can reduce these risks and enhance safety for everyone.<sup>82</sup>



### THE BENEFITS OF WALKING & CYCLING

Getting out of your car can improve health from increased physical activity and reduced obesity;<sup>83,84</sup> lead to less deaths and injuries from road trauma;<sup>85</sup> reduce social isolation;<sup>86</sup> decrease pollution (and respiratory and heart disease);<sup>87</sup> and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>88</sup>

## Obesity prevalence and rates of active transport



The Journal of Physical Activity and Health 2008

# Healthier homes and buildings

Improving the energy efficiency of houses and buildings, together with improvements in indoor air quality, can offer important health gains as well as financial savings in addition to emissions reductions.<sup>89,90,91</sup>

Residential and commercial buildings account for around 20 per cent of Australia's greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>92</sup> Reducing energy demand and improving energy efficiency could substantially reduce the sector's greenhouse gas emissions,<sup>93</sup> reduce energy infrastructure costs, and deliver a net economic benefit.<sup>94</sup> There are clear benefits for public health from improvements to household energy use through the introduction of measures to conserve (use less) energy, improve energy efficiency, and by switching to cleaner energy sources.<sup>95</sup>

Energy efficiency offers the cheapest emissions abatement opportunities, and reductions can be achieved quickly using existing technology.<sup>96</sup> Changes to building and urban design can reduce health risks by mitigating against the urban heat island effect (i.e. higher relative temperatures in metropolitan areas due to heat absorption by building materials), and help accrue financial savings over time.<sup>97</sup>

Many emissions reduction strategies in homes and buildings that also provide good household ventilation can improve health and wellbeing<sup>98,99</sup> and reduce health risks, particularly among elderly people and very young children.<sup>100</sup> Through minimising fluctuations in temperature, improving the energy efficiency of buildings can

lead to reductions in premature deaths as well as reduce the incidence of heart disease, asthma, respiratory diseases and strokes.<sup>101,102</sup>

The enhanced housing comfort that comes from being consistently warmer or cooler due to energy efficiency measures such as insulation is also associated with better mental health.<sup>103,104</sup>

Introducing or expanding parks, gardens, and other green spaces around homes and buildings can reduce energy use (cutting emissions as well as costs) and air pollution, as well as provide important physical and mental health benefits.<sup>105</sup>




Research shows people living in urban areas have a more positive outlook on life and higher life satisfaction when they have access to natural environments.<sup>106</sup> Exposure to nature is also associated with an ability to cope with and recover from stress, and recover from illness and injury.<sup>107</sup> By creating shade and providing local protection from weather, plants and trees in urban green spaces can also help moderate extremes of heat and cold.<sup>108</sup>

## MAKING HEALTH CARE HEALTHIER

The health sector is big energy user and source of greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>109</sup> In NSW for example, health facilities account for 53 per cent of the total NSW Government buildings energy usage.<sup>110</sup> Health care buildings such as hospitals, nursing homes and clinics can realise significant economic and health benefits from the implementation of sustainability strategies to reduce energy use. Other benefits to health can be realised through improving ventilation in health care settings as this can reduce can reduce cross-infection of airborne diseases.<sup>111</sup> Improved procurement practices can reduce emissions and save on resources.

Improved management of waste offers health benefits as well as emissions reductions through composting, recycling, better purchasing and minimising transport of waste, large quantities of waste can be avoided, and disposal of toxic waste reduced.<sup>112</sup> The use of information and communications technology to provide services can reduce emissions as well as also improve health outcomes: through targeted and individualised consultations, 'telehealth' has been demonstrated to be associated with effective management of mental health issues, heart and lung conditions, diabetes and high risk pregnancies.<sup>113</sup>



There are important potential benefits for public health in Australia from improvements to built environment and health sector energy use through the introduction of measures to conserve (use less) energy; improve energy efficiency and by switching to cleaner energy sources.<sup>114</sup>



# Protecting our ecosystems

Human health and survival depends on a healthy natural environment for clean air, soil and water, as well as many naturally derived medicines.<sup>115</sup> Biodiversity—the diversity of plants and animals, and the ecosystems of which they are a part—is the foundation of agriculture and human health. Healthy landscapes and waterways provide society with vital ecosystem services, such as in waste recycling and our supply of nutrients.<sup>116</sup> Ecosystems can help prevent the spread of disease<sup>117</sup> and provide important psychological benefits.<sup>118,119</sup> The health and wellbeing of human beings and the natural environment are tightly linked.<sup>120,121,122</sup>

Strategies to protect and restore biodiversity can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and remove carbon from the air.<sup>123</sup> Australia's natural ecosystems are the country's biggest natural store of carbon.<sup>124</sup> Australia has the potential to achieve significant emissions reductions by its biophysical capacity to draw down carbon dioxide through biodiversity, according to the CSIRO.<sup>125</sup> Australia's native forests have enormous sequestration potential. For example, it is estimated that ending the logging of native forests in southeastern Australia could draw down around 140Mt of CO<sub>2</sub> each year.<sup>126</sup>

Exposure to natural environments is demonstrated to have important physical and mental human health benefits.<sup>127</sup> Contact with nature can reduce the risk of disease, improve general wellbeing (including mental health and emotional resilience), and increase longevity.<sup>128</sup>

Studies from the US and UK suggest that urban forests can help draw down greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce air pollution, and reduce energy demand by helping to alleviate the disproportionate temperature increases in metropolitan areas known as the 'urban heat island' effect.<sup>129,130</sup>

Vegetation can also assist in the absorption of pollutants, such as ground-level ozone and nitrous dioxide, and through the cooling and protection from weather it provides, can reduce emissions from power generation by reducing energy consumption. Air quality can be improved as plants and trees intercept dust, ash, dirt, pollen, and smoke which can reduce respiratory disease, including asthma.<sup>131</sup> Heat-related deaths and illnesses can be minimised by utilising the localised cooling plants provide through shade and evapotranspiration (the release of water vapour from plants to the surrounding air).<sup>132</sup>





# Eating our way to better health (and a safer climate)

The food and agriculture sectors offer important pathways for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and improvements in public health.<sup>133</sup> Globally and in Australia, emissions from agriculture make a substantial contribution to climate change. Australia's per capita agricultural emissions are among the highest in the world—and very high for a developed country.

Around 20 per cent of Australia's net annual emissions stem from food and fibre production and deforestation.<sup>134</sup> Ruminant livestock (i.e. cattle and sheep) are currently the largest single source of methane—a potent greenhouse gas.<sup>135</sup> Nitrous oxide is another potent greenhouse gas associated with some fertilisers and livestock, though produced in lower quantities.<sup>136</sup> At present, livestock contribute around 70 per cent of Australia's methane emissions,<sup>137</sup> and about 12 per cent of the country's carbon pollution overall.<sup>138</sup>

A rapid worldwide growth in meat consumption is driving emissions growth and contributing to diseases such as ischaemic heart disease, obesity, and colorectal cancers,<sup>139</sup> highlighting the common drivers between high emissions lifestyles and the global epidemic of chronic diseases.<sup>140</sup>

A 2009 study in *The Lancet* found that reducing animal product consumption by 30 per cent would lead to a 15 per cent reduction in the burden of ischaemic heart disease.<sup>141</sup> Combined with technological improvements in agricultural production, this could deliver greenhouse gas emissions reductions of 50 per cent in the farm sector by 2030 in countries such as the UK.<sup>142</sup>

Reductions in red meat consumption in Australia from the (current) average of 100g to 50g per person per day have been predicted to reduce annual emissions from livestock by 13.3 MtCO<sub>2</sub>-e (about 22 per cent) as well as cutting the incidence of colorectal cancer by 11 per cent.<sup>143</sup>



# 20%


Around 20 per cent of Australia's net annual emissions stem from food and fibre production and deforestation.





Progressively changing the diets of people in affluent societies like Australia is an important climate change mitigation strategy, and one that could also result in significant public health benefits.

Moderating our consumption of meat and dairy products will lower the incidence of obesity, ischaemic heart disease and stroke, while cutting consumption of processed meat will reduce the incidence of colorectal cancers.



Changes to Australia's food systems have the potential to make a sizeable contribution to climate change mitigation through the sequestration of carbon and moving to lower emissions production.

But production changes alone are unlikely to be sufficient in the long run; changes to food supply chains and consumption will also be important. In turn, these will improve public health and reduce demand on the healthcare system.<sup>144</sup>

Improvements in farming practices have the potential to reduce carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide emissions as well as improve environmental conservation, which itself has public health benefits (see above).

One major pathway to improving population health and reducing emissions is through changes in the Australian diet.<sup>145</sup> Moderating our consumption of meat and dairy products will lower the incidence of obesity, ischaemic heart disease and stroke, while cutting consumption of processed meat will reduce the incidence of colorectal cancers.<sup>146,147</sup>

# Conclusion

This paper demonstrates why it is important to evaluate health costs and benefits in developing policy solutions to climate change.

It is clear, from numerous studies and real-world examples, that substantial benefits are available to health from strategies to cut emissions, including cleaner transport and energy systems.<sup>148</sup> Many of these strategies come at a relatively modest cost but the health benefits can start to be realised immediately, while climate benefits accumulate over the long term.<sup>149</sup>

These shorter term and localised health benefits of emissions reductions can help reduce or offset the costs of climate action as well as provide greater incentives to act right now. Many people see climate change as something in the distant future and not an immediate threat. Quantifying and communicating the real, tangible, and immediate health benefits possible from cutting emissions can help build public support for climate action.

Coal-fired power, for instance, comes with a significant human health cost in terms of respiratory, cardiovascular, and nervous system diseases.<sup>150,151</sup> Conservative estimates put the total health costs to the Australian community from burning fossil fuels at around \$6 billion annually. Economic modelling from other countries, however, suggests the savings for health from cutting emissions in the energy sector in particular are likely to be much greater. Avoiding the public costs of ill-health associated with greenhouse gas emissions will free up the investment dollars and productivity needed for Australia's transition to a low-carbon economy.

Better information is needed about the health benefits of climate strategies here in Australia. An understanding of the economic savings associated with the health co-benefits from cutting emissions

across a range of sectors will help build political and public support for action. This requires researchers to evaluate potential health gains as well as existing health costs. But the task goes beyond the health sector. Collaboration across portfolios—health, climate, energy, transport, agriculture, and environment—is needed to get the best results. And, as a champion for better health, the health sector needs to be supported to reduce its own ecological footprint so it delivers the broadest benefits possible.

Finally, given both the tremendous health risks of a more hostile Australian climate and the potential benefits of action, a national health and climate change plan is needed. Such a plan could help communities, businesses and government better prepare for climate change, take advantage of the opportunities provided by low-carbon initiatives, and take actions that cut emissions and promote better human health.

Photograph: Michael Hall





# Endnotes

1. Egger, G. Personal carbon trading: a "stealth intervention" for obesity reduction? *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2007, 187:3, pp.185-187.
2. Kjellstrom, T., et al. Air pollution and its health impacts: the changing panorama, *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2002, 177, pp. 604-608.
3. Biegler, T. The hidden costs of electricity: Externalities of power generation in Australia, Report for the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering (ATSE), 2009. Available online: <http://www.atse.org.au/resource-centre/func-startdown/63>
4. *ibid*
5. Australian State of the Environment Committee, State of the Environment 2011 (SoE 2011), Independent report to the Australian Government Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, 2011; Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics, Health Impacts of Transport Emissions in Australia: Economic Costs, Working Paper 63, Commonwealth of Australia, 2005.
6. Markandya, A. et al. p. 41
7. Intergovernmental Panel in Climate Change (IPCC), Climate Change 2007: Working Group III: Mitigation of Climate Change, Co-benefits of mitigation. Available at: [http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg3/en/tssts-ts-11-5-co-benefits-of.html](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg3/en/tssts-ts-11-5-co-benefits-of.html)
8. Health and Environment Alliance and Health Care Without Harm Europe, Acting Now for Better Health, Report, August 2010. Available at: [http://www.env-health.org/IMG/pdf/HEAL\\_30\\_co-benefits\\_report\\_-\\_FULL.pdf](http://www.env-health.org/IMG/pdf/HEAL_30_co-benefits_report_-_FULL.pdf)
9. World Health Organisation, Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Housing Sector, 2011. Available at [http://www.who.int/hia/green\\_economy/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/hia/green_economy/en/index.html)
10. Woodcock, J. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: urban land transport, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009. Available at: <http://www.thelancet.com/series/health-and-climate-change>
11. World Health Organisation, Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Transport Sector, 2011. Available at [http://www.who.int/hia/green\\_economy/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/hia/green_economy/en/index.html)
12. Aguirre, A.A., Tabor, G.M. Global factors driving emerging infectious diseases, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 2008; 1149: 1–3.
13. cohabinitiative, The importance of biodiversity to human health, *Biodiversity and Global Health 1*, UN CBD COP 10 Policy brief, October 2010; Cassis, G. Biodiversity loss: a human health issue, *MJA* 1998; 169: 568-569.
14. Durban Declaration on Climate and Health, 4 December 2011. Available at: [http://www.env-health.org/IMG/pdf/Durban\\_Declaration\\_on\\_Climate\\_and\\_Health\\_Final.pdf](http://www.env-health.org/IMG/pdf/Durban_Declaration_on_Climate_and_Health_Final.pdf)
15. Costello A, Abbas M, Allen A et al. Managing the health effects of climate change. *Lancet* 2009; 373: 1693-1733.
16. Costello A, et al, *ibid*.
17. Green, D. Climate Change and Health: Impacts on Remote Indigenous Communities in Northern Australia, Climate Change Impacts and Risk, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research Paper 012, November 2006.
18. Garnaut, R. Australia's emissions in a global context, in *The Garnaut Climate Change Review: Final Report*, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p.158.
19. Garnaut, R. Australia's emissions in a global context, in *The Garnaut Climate Change Review: Final Report*, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p.158.
20. Physicians for Social Responsibility, Coal's Assault on Human Health, 2009. Available online: <http://www.psr.org/assets/pdfs/psr-coal-fullreport.pdf>
21. Epstein, P. R. Full cost accounting for the life cycle of coal, in *Ecological Economics Reviews*, Costanza, R., Limburg, K. & Kubiszewski, I. (eds), *Annals Of The New York Academy Of Sciences*, 1219: 73–98.
22. Physicians for Social Responsibility, Coal's Assault on Human Health, 2009. Available online: <http://www.psr.org/assets/pdfs/psr-coal-fullreport.pdf>
23. Hendryx, M. Ahem M.M. Relations between Health Indicators and Residential Proximity to Coal Mining in West Virginia, *American Journal of Public Health* (2008) 669-671.
24. Wellenius GA, Schwartz J, Mittleman MA. Air pollution and hospital admissions for ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke among medicare beneficiaries, *Stroke* 2005; 36(12):2549–2553.
25. Kjellstrom, T., et al. Air pollution and its health impacts: the changing panorama, *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2002, 177, pp. 604-608.
26. Biegler, T. The hidden costs of electricity: Externalities of power generation in Australia, Report for the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering (ATSE), 2009. Available online: <http://www.atse.org.au/resource-centre/func-startdown/63>
27. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Directory of mining statistics, 2002. Canberra: ABS, 2002: 49-63. (ABS Cat. No. 1144.0.) [http://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/ausstats/free.nsf/0/9AD51E2188924080CA256C8B0082DFD7/File/11440\\_2002.pdf](http://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/ausstats/free.nsf/0/9AD51E2188924080CA256C8B0082DFD7/File/11440_2002.pdf) (cited in Castelden et al, *Medical Journal of Australia* 2011; 195 (6): 333-335)
28. OECD, Ancillary benefits and costs of greenhouse gas mitigation, Proceedings of an IPCC co-sponsored workshop, 2000.
29. Markandya, A. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: low carbon electricity production, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009, pp.36-45.
30. Haines, A. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: overview and implications for policy-makers, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009, p. 70.
31. Markandya, A. et al. p.40
32. Health and Environment Alliance and Health Care Without Harm Europe, Acting Now for Better Health, Report, August 2010. Available at: [http://www.env-health.org/IMG/pdf/HEAL\\_30\\_co-benefits\\_report\\_-\\_FULL.pdf](http://www.env-health.org/IMG/pdf/HEAL_30_co-benefits_report_-_FULL.pdf)
33. World Health Organisation, Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Household Energy Sector in Developing Countries, 2011.
34. World Health Organization, Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Household Energy Sector in Developing Countries, 2011.
35. Ramanathan, V et al. Global and regional climate changes due to black carbon, *Nature Geoscience*, Vol 1, April 2008, pp. 221-227.
36. Wilkinson, P. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: household energy, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009.
37. Shindell, D. et al. Simultaneously mitigating near term climate change and improving human health and food security, *Science*, 2012, 335, pp.183-189.
38. World Health Organisation, Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Transport Sector, 2011.
39. Clancy, L. et al. Effect of air-pollution control on death rates in Dublin, Ireland: an intervention study *The Lancet*, Vol 360, October 19, 2002.
40. World Health Organisation, Tackling the global clean air challenge, 26 September 2011.
41. Australian State of the Environment Committee, State of the Environment 2011 (SoE 2011), Independent report to the Australian Government Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, 2011; Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics, Health Impacts of Transport Emissions in Australia: Economic Costs, Working Paper 63, Commonwealth of Australia, 2005.
42. OECD, OECD Environmental Outlook to 2050: The Consequences of Inaction, 2012.
43. Cifuentes, L. et al. Assessing the health benefits of urban air pollution reductions associated with climate change mitigation (2000-2020): Santiago, São Paulo, Mexico City, and New York City. *Environ Health Perspectives* 2001, 109:S419-S425.
44. Bell, M. L. et al. Ancillary human health benefits of improved air quality resulting from climate change mitigation, *Environmental Health* 2008, 7:41.
45. Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics, Health Impacts of Transport Emissions in Australia: Economic Costs, Working Paper 63, Commonwealth of Australia, 2005.
46. Health and Environment Alliance and Health Care Without Harm Europe, *ibid*.

47. Health and Environment Alliance and Health Care Without Harm Europe, *ibid*.
48. Nemet, G. F. et al. Implications of improving air quality co-benefits into climate change policy-making, *Environmental Research Letters*, 2010, 5: 014007.
49. Markandya, A. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: low carbon electricity production, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009, p.42
50. Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Co-benefits of climate policy, PBL Report no. 500116005, February 2009.
51. Health and Environment Alliance and Health Care Without Harm Europe, *ibid*.
52. Environ Australia, Cleaner Non-road Diesel Engine Project – Identification and Recommendation of Measures to Support the Uptake of Cleaner Non-road Diesel Engines in Australia, Prepared for NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and Australian Government Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, April 2010. Available at <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/air/nonroadiediesel.htm>
53. Smith, K. R. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: health implications of short lived greenhouse gas pollutants, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009, p.59.
54. Smith, K. R. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: health implications of short lived greenhouse gas pollutants, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009, p.56.
55. Union of Concerned Scientists, *Climate Change and Your Health: Rising Temperatures, Worsening Ozone Pollution*, June 2011.
56. Union of Concerned Scientists, *Climate Change and Your Health: Rising Temperatures, Worsening Ozone Pollution*, June 2011.
57. Department of the Environment and Heritage, Ground-level ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Air quality fact sheet, 2005.
58. Union of Concerned Scientists, *Climate Change and Your Health: Rising Temperatures, Worsening Ozone Pollution*, June 2011.
59. Larouche, R. (2012). The environmental and population health benefits of active transport: A review. *Greenhouse Gases – Emissions, Measurement and Management*. InTech. ISBN 979-953-307-224-0. [http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfs/32358/InTech-The\\_environmental\\_and\\_population\\_health\\_benefits\\_of\\_active\\_transport\\_a\\_review.pdf](http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfs/32358/InTech-The_environmental_and_population_health_benefits_of_active_transport_a_review.pdf)
60. Larouche, *ibid*
61. Haines, A. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: overview and implications for policy-makers, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009
62. Lindsay, G. et al. Moving urban trips from cars to bicycles: impact on health and emissions, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 2011, 35:1, pp.54-60.
63. Biegler, T. *The hidden costs of electricity: Externalities of power generation in Australia*, 2009, Report for the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering (ATSE). Available online: <http://www.atse.org.au/resource-centre/func-startdown/63>.
64. Stanley, J et al. Road transport and climate change: stepping off the greenhouse gas, Working Paper ITLS-WP-09-2, Institute of Transport and Logistic Studies, University of Sydney, 2009. [http://sydney.edu.au/business/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/36282/itls-wp-09-21.pdf](http://sydney.edu.au/business/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/36282/itls-wp-09-21.pdf)
65. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Transport Sector*, 2011.
66. Dobson, R. GPs to be creative in prescribing exercise (news), *British Medical Journal*, 2009, 339:417.
67. De Hartog, J.J. et al. Do the health benefits of cycling outweigh the risks? *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 2010, 8:8.
68. Cavill, N. et al. Review of transport economic analyses including health effects related to cycling and walking, *Transport Policy*, 2008, 15, pp.291-304.
69. Frank, L. et al. Obesity relationships with community design, physical activity and time spent in cars, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 2004, 27:2, 87-96.
70. Frank, L. et al. *ibid*.
71. Corderoy, A. Obesity is now more deadly than smoking, *The Age*, 9 April 2010.
72. Obesity Working Group, Technical Paper 1: Obesity in Australia: a need for urgent action, Prepared for the Preventative Health Taskforce, October 2008 to June 2009.
- Obesity Working Group, Technical Paper 1: Obesity in Australia: a need for urgent action, Prepared for the Preventative Health Taskforce, October 2008 to June 2009.
74. Access Economics, The growing costs of obesity in 2008, Report for Diabetes Australia, August 2008.
75. Obesity Working Group, Technical Paper 1: Obesity in Australia: a need for urgent action, Prepared for the Preventative Health Taskforce, October 2008 to June 2009.
76. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Transport Sector*, 2011.
77. Chapman, R. Transitioning to low carbon urban form and transport in New Zealand, *Political Science*, 2008, 60:89.
78. Douglas, M. et al. Are cars the new tobacco? *Journal of Public Health*, 2011, 33:2, pp. 160-169.
79. Woodcock, J. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: urban land transport, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009.
80. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Transport Sector*, 2011.
81. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Transport Sector*, 2011.
82. Douglas, M. et al. Are cars the new tobacco? *Journal of Public Health*, 2011, 33:2, pp. 160-169.
83. Woodcock, J. et al. *ibid*.
84. Wen, L., et al, Driving to work and overweight and obesity: findings from the 2003 New South Wales Health Survey, Australia, *International Journal of Obesity*, 2006, 30:5, pp. 782-786.
85. Larouche, *ibid*
86. Elvik, R (2009). The non-linearity of risk and the promotion of environmentally sustainable transport. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 41(4): 849-55.
87. Garrard, J. Active transport: Adults - An overview of recent evidence, VicHealth, December 2009.
88. Dennekamp, M. and Carey, M. Air quality and chronic disease: why action on climate change is also good for health, *NSW Public Health Bulletin*, Vol. 21(5-6) 2010.
89. Larouche, *ibid*.
90. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Housing Sector*, 2011.
91. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Transport Sector*, 2011.
92. Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics, *Health Impacts of Transport Emissions in Australia: Economic Costs*, Working Paper 63, Commonwealth of Australia, 2005.
93. The Centre for International Economics, *The buildings sector and greenhouse: key facts*. Available at: <http://www.yourbuilding.org/library/carbonfootprint.pdf>
94. *ibid*
95. Langham, E. et al. *Building Our Savings: Reduced Infrastructure Costs From Improving Building Energy Efficiency*, Institute for Sustainable Futures (University of Technology, Sydney) and Energetics, Report for the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, 2010.
96. Wilkinson, P. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: household energy, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009.
97. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Housing Sector*, 2011.
98. Younger, M. et al. The built environment, climate change, and health: opportunities for co-benefits, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 2008, 35:5, pp.517-526.
99. ClimateWorks Australia, *Low carbon growth plan for Australia*, 2011 Update, April 2011. Available at: <http://www.climateworksaustralia.org/ClimateWorks%20Australia%20Low%20Carbon%20Growth%20Plan%202011%20Update.pdf>
100. World Health Organisation, *Health in the Green*

Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Housing Sector, 2011.

101. Health Evidence Network, Is housing improvement a potential health improvement strategy? Report for World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, February 2005.
102. World Health Organisation, Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Housing Sector, 2011.
103. Levy, J. I. et al. The public health benefits of insulation retrofits in existing housing in the United States, *Environmental Health*, 2003, 2:4.
104. Health Evidence Network, Is housing improvement a potential health improvement strategy? Report for World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, February 2005.
105. World Health Organisation, Health in the Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Housing Sector, 2011.
106. Maller, C. et al. Healthy nature healthy people: 'contact with nature' as an upstream health promotion intervention for populations, *Health Promotion International*, 2005, Vol. 21 No. 1.
107. *ibid*
108. Akbari, H. et al. Cool surfaces and shade trees to reduce energy use and improve air quality in urban areas, *Solar Energy*, 2001, 70:3, Pp. 295–310.
109. World Health Organization and Health Care Without Harm, *Healthy Hospitals Healthy Planet Healthy People: Addressing Climate Change In Health Care Settings*, Discussion Draft, 2009.
110. Pencheon, D. Et Al. Health Sector Leadership In Mitigating Climate Change: Experience From The UK And NSW, *New South Wales Public Health Bulletin*, 2010, 20:5067, Pp.173–176.
111. Qian, H. Et Al. Natural Ventilation For Reducing Airborne Infection In Hospitals, *Building And Environment*, March 2010, 45:3, Pp. 559–565.
112. World Health Organization and Health Care Without Harm, *Healthy Hospitals Healthy Planet Healthy People: Addressing Climate Change In Health Care Settings*, Discussion Draft, 2009.
113. World Health Organisation, Health In The Green Economy: Co-benefits to health of climate change mitigation – Healthcare Sector, 2011.

114. Wilkinson, P. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: household energy, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009.
115. Newman, D. et al. Medicines from nature, in *Sustaining Life: How Human Health Depends on Biodiversity*, Chivian, E. and Bernstein, A. (eds), 2008.
116. VicHealth, A Response to Land and Biodiversity at a Time of Climate Change, Submission in Response to the Consultation Paper Land and Biodiversity at a Time of Climate Change, 2 July 2007.
117. Aguirre AA, Tabor GM. Global factors driving emerging infectious diseases, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 2008; 1149: 1–3.
118. cohabinitiative, The importance of biodiversity to human health, *Biodiversity and Global Health 1*, UN CBD COP 10 Policy brief, October 2010; Cassis, G. Biodiversity loss: a human health issue, *Medical Journal of Australia* 1998; 169: 568-569.
119. Sala, O.E. et al. Biodiversity, change and human health: From ecosystems services to spread of disease, Washington DC, Island Press, 2008.
120. Cassis, G. Biodiversity loss: a human health issue, *Medical Journal of Australia*, 1998, 169: 568-569.
121. Guest, C., Douglas, R., Woodruff, R., and McMichael, T., Health and the Environment, Australian Conservation Foundation and Australian Medical Association, 1999.
122. Ehrlich, P. R and Ehrlich, A. H. The Value of Biodiversity, *Ambio*, Vol. 21, No. 3, Economics of Biodiversity Loss May, 1992, pp. 219-226.
123. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity for National and International Policy Makers – Summary: Responding to the Value of Nature, Part iv, 2009. Available at: <http://www.teebweb.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=4Y2nqqllCg%3D>
124. Cosier, P. Carbon and Landscape Conservation in Australia, Presentation to 2010 National Landcare Forum, 22 to 24 March, 2010, Adelaide, South Australia.
125. CSIRO, 2009. Analysis of Greenhouse Gas Mitigation and Carbon Biosequestration

Opportunities from Rural Land Use, Prepared for the Queensland Premiers Climate Council.

126. Garnaut, 2008, p. 165.
127. Townsend M and Weerasuriya R. Beyond Blue to Green: The benefits of contact with nature for mental health and well-being, 2010, Beyond Blue Limited: Melbourne, Australia.
128. Townsend et al, Beyond blue to green, 2010, p.19.
129. Silva, H.R. et al, Modeling effects of urban heat island mitigation strategies on heat-related morbidity: a case study for Phoenix, Arizona, USA, *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 2010, 54:1, pp.13-22.
130. McPherson, E. G. and Simpson, J. R. Potential energy savings in buildings by an urban tree planting programme in California. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 2003, 2:2, 73-86.
131. Lovasi et al., 2008 cited in Sarajevs, V. Health Benefits of Street Trees, *Forest Research, The Research Agency of the Forestry Commission*, 2011.
132. Luber, G. et al. Climate Change and Extreme Heat Events, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 2008, 35:5, pp.429–435.
133. Harvie, J. et al. Common Drivers Common Solutions: Chronic disease, Climate Change, Nutrition and Agriculture, Food Systems and Public Health Conference, January 30, 2011.
134. Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, Australia's emissions projections 2010. Available at: <http://www.climatechange.gov.au/publications/projections/australias-emissions-projections/emissions-projection-2010.aspx>.
135. Victorian Department of Primary Industries, GIa: Methane Research Project, Greenhouse Emissions from Australian Agriculture. Available at: <http://www.dpi.vic.gov.au/agriculture/dairy/emissions-in-dairy/methane-research2> Accessed 13 July 2012.
136. McMichael, A. J. et al. Food, livestock production, energy, climate change, and health, *Energy and Health Series 5, The Lancet*, Vol 370 October 6, 2007.
137. Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, Australia's emission projections, Commonwealth of Australia 2010.
138. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and

- Forestry, Australia's Farming Future, Climate Change Research Program, Emissions Reduction. Available at [http://www.daff.gov.au/climatechange/australias-farming-future/climate-change-and-productivity-research/emissions\\_reduction2](http://www.daff.gov.au/climatechange/australias-farming-future/climate-change-and-productivity-research/emissions_reduction2)
139. McMichael, 2007, *ibid*, p.1254.
140. Egger, G. Personal carbon trading: a potential "stealth intervention" for obesity reduction? *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2007, 187:3, pp.185-187.
141. Friel, S. et al. *ibid*, p. 46.
142. Friel, S. et al. *ibid*, p. 46.
143. Friel, S. Climate change, food insecurity and chronic diseases: sustainable and healthy policy opportunities for Australia, Vol. 21(5–6) 2010 NSW Public Health Bulletin, p 132.
144. Stehfest, E. et al., 'Climate benefits of changing diet', *Climatic Change*, 95 (2009), 83–102; McMichael, A. J., Powles, J. W., Butler, C. D., Uauy, R., 'Food, livestock production, energy, climate change, and health', *The Lancet*, 377/9594 (2007), 1253–126.
145. Friel, S. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: food and agriculture, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009, p. 51.
146. Haines, A. and Dora, C. How the low carbon economy can improve health, *Spotlight, British Medical Journal*, 2012, 344.
147. Friel, S. et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: food and agriculture, *The Lancet, Health and Climate Change Series 1*, November 2009, p. 51.
148. Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Co-benefits of climate policy, PBL Report no. 500116005, February 2009.
149. Pan American Health Organisation and World Health Organisation, Reducing climate change is good for your health, Media release, 14 June 2011.
150. Kjellstrom, T., et al. Air pollution and its health impacts: the changing panorama, *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2002, 177, pp. 604-608.
151. Biegler, T. The hidden costs of electricity: Externalities of power generation in Australia, 2009, Report for the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering (ATSE). Available online: [30](http://www.atse.org.au/resource-centre/func-</a></li></ol></div><div data-bbox=)

[www.climateinstitute.org.au](http://www.climateinstitute.org.au)  
[www.caha.org.au](http://www.caha.org.au)