

## Review of the Climate Change Act – Submission

### Climate Change:

Q1: The critical challenges to which the Climate Change Legislation and Government Action should respond are

- 1) Finding the money for a second Bass Link Cable
- 2) The complexity and costs for hydraulic power generation recirculation of dam outflow
- 3) The complexity and cost to build new whole-of-state power generation infrastructure and the likely most efficient solution would be nuclear and massive renewable
- 4) The realisation that the few forestry jobs that are created (in reality) are not worth as much as keeping our forests as a natural "Carbon Sink".

Q2: Personally, I feel the act is merely a political football. Great in words and on paper, but ineffective and inefficient in a practical sense. Why? Tasmania just does not have the money. In China, there is a common expression, "One apple, many mouths." Think about all the projects demanding money.

Q3: Personally, I believe that energy consumption efficiencies could be greatly improved on a household level. The caveat, if a home owner wants to insulate their house or install more energy efficient insulation, hot water cylinders, appliances, converting the whole house to LED bulbs at \$17.50 per light, where the heck is someone receiving NewStar Allowance in the state with the traditionally highest unemployment figures going to get the funds needed, (tens of thousands of dollars) to retrofit and upgrade their home? IF the State government or Aurora Energy (state owned) agrees to indefinite interest-free loans of even doing it for free to those holding a Concession Card, where will the state get the money from. It all comes back to lack of money and who is going to pay? For example, we all know that an electric car is ideal toward meeting Climate Change targets. So, everyone drive your old Holden hoon-mobile to the nearest wrecking yard, take a taxi to the nearest Tesla car dealership and buy one . . . Oh, Oh. No money, cannot qualify for a bank loan . . . Get it?!

Q4: The Act does not need "weasel-words" to spruik the Tasmanian clean green image. Do you really think some mega-rich investor or tourist from China reads that stuff or would even be interested, even if written in Chinese, when they come and spit on our foot paths, smoke in our hotel rooms, and demand immediate service and to fall all over them, just because they are wealthy Chinese spending millions of tourist dollars on Tasmania or buy up half of Sandy Bay. Wake up! You are not living in the real world.

What may make it more attractive to some international tourists from the West would be seeing more grassy parks and leafy tree-lined streets, with everyone pedalling around in their fluorescent skin tight lycra with big smile on their faces high on endorphins or whatever the drug du jour is amongst the hipsters and yuppies.

Go to most any home or hotel or business in China or Europe and you won't see one hot water cylinder, but small, very efficient instantaneous hot water systems.

Q5: By including Tasmania in national Carbon emissions, and meeting targets, I believe it gives an abnormally low indication of just how great Australia is doing. Tasmania is sufficiently removed from the mainland that it should be considered separately. Tasmania, has its own unique climate which may be affected quite differently than the mainland.

Q6: Whether the number is 1.2°C 2.0°C or 2.2°C, we know what is the right thing to do and should act sooner than later. And, at the end of the day, it is all a great experiment. All our very best efforts could be wiped out in a 24 hour period with the disgorgement of one super-volcano or meteor impact. Regardless, we should do the right thing and think about the next 100 years, and the quality of life of our children, grand children, their great grand children.

Q7: The Act should include a mandate by Aurora Energy to proactively assure that every house and business is well insulated and have double glazing and offer financial incentives, such as interest free loans, etc. to assure it is done. It should provide that any contractor doing the work meet a standard and more importantly their workmanship meet a standard. Too many morons in the building industry, whom will use left-over or waste insulation of the inappropriate R Value to stuff your walls and ceilings, because their is not Quality Control or proper inspection or Inspectors whom are not corruptible or mates of someone. Thus, the Act should include severe penalties for shoddy workmanship. Contractors should have a Bond or Insurance that if they go out of business and their workmanship, years later was discovered to be shonky, then someone should pay, other than the home owner.

Q8: Most Councils are more interested in infrastructure projects and protecting jobs and incomes of long-term Council employees and eye-wash projects that say "Look we are doing something for the community". All crap! They have a fixed budget and not one dollar to spare to clean up the Clyde River, for example . . . That is someone else's responsibility. If the State has no money and the 29 Councils have other fiscal priorities, then who will fund Climate Change programs?

Q9: Making Tasmania look like Ayers Rock floating in the Southern Ocean will do nothing for Climate Change, huh? Yet, it will provide 1,400 jobs. Big whoop! Taken in context of what a 2 to 5°C increase in global warming would do for Tasmania. Sure, it will make Tasmania rival the Coonawarra, in wine production, but if there is a global wine over-supply, how will that effect our state's economy. Think ahead. Plan rationally.

Take a look up in the Central Highlands, where the draught and disease has killed off its Eucalypt Forests, farmers stripping the landscape from horizon to horizon for grazing, and the much celebrated traditional (Aboriginal) burning to herd their prey has made it look like the surface of the Moon in large swaths. That should be replanted with Eucalypts and bush for birds and wildlife and properly managed by Forestry to add to Tasmania's "Carbon Sink". Trees absorb carbon. Dead trees and those felled by farmers and logging don't. Not too hard to understand, even for a non-scientist.

Q10: Whatever emissions target is actually and practically achievable. Do not set a

target that is unachievable or that will cost the state government money for not meeting the target.

Q11: As exporting electricity is a good business model, so long as the damned levels are not rock bottom and the hydro-electric generators aren't vacuuming dirt from the bottom of reservoirs, then it would not make much sense to hold Tasmania to account for the mainland's usage or wastage, thus cop a fine for it. Tasmania really needs to be weighed separately from the national targets account. Maybe importing electricity is a different matter, because it would depend on our state's efficiency, but should Tasmania be penalised during a serve drought???

Q12: Sectoral targets are not practical. How would they be monitored and reported? The numbers could be manipulated or just made up, especially if it means the State or Federal government would make money available for meeting or exceeding targets.

Q13: OK. I agree. My house is not very well insulated, but I have done everything I can, within my small budget. I could only afford to convert half my household light bulbs to LED. I have used left-over bubble wrap to insulate my Hot Water Cylinder, insulated every exposed pipe, greatly reduced my energy consumption, since the previous owner, BUT, I have wall-to-ceiling windows, and poorly insulated walls. I would like to reduce the size of the windows and make them double glazed, plus add insulation to the attic and walls, but I just do not have the money for it. I would like to have a solar panel array to make my house completely self-sufficient, but cannot afford it and then there are not real incentives. So, I am 100% willing. Are you willing to help?

Q14: Policy #1 should be able to be read and understood by 95% of Tasmanians, be practical, be achievable, be thinking 100 years ahead, not merely 20 years. Policy should be retrospective. What good is policy to assure all new construction meets a standard, but 90% of construction does not meet the standard or scope of the Act, because they were built by morons only interested in a quick buck, 30 years ago. Retrospective policy will cost more initially, but will ultimately enable you to meet targets.

Addendum: Regarding the Statewide Planning Scheme, I do not have very much confidence in Council Planners and Planning Committees. It is insufficiently transparent, corruptible, subject to personal bias, nepotistic practices, and stringing someone along for more than 30 years over a development application, before returning his Bond.

Development/Planning Applications Approval Processing should be removed from the hands of individual Councils. ANY AND ALL Construction must be properly inspected, with stand-over tactics, by the Squad of Inspectors, if necessary, to assure 100% compliance. Each and every home or business or building for sale MUST HAVE a Pre-Purchase Inspection by State Accredited Inspectors. This will rein in construction that was done without Permit, half-assed construction, construction (including plumbing and electrical) not meeting current best practices or Codes.

What I think. Take it or leave it.

Robert Cassidy