

View results

Respondent

11

Anonymous

89:14

Time to complete

1. Do you agree with the proposed vision and goals for the action plan? Which goals are you most supportive of? Are there any other goals that should be considered?

I support the goals of the action plan, but consider that the targets are weak and lack details of how they will be implemented or measured.

Missed opportunities include:

a) Electrifying the government vehicle fleet will be a small step. There needs to be significant investment in EV charging infrastructure before this is a viable option. There are already insufficient facilities outside the major population areas, which discourages uptake of EVs by the general public. The public transport fleet includes many old and high-emissions vehicles - there needs to be a rapid transition to electrifying the Metro fleet, which will also reduce diesel fumes in the Hobart city area.

b) Transport emissions continue to increase. There are few options for reducing private vehicle usage. Public transport has a very limited schedule outside of peak hours and buses are caught up in the same traffic jams as cars. They should be dedicated lanes for buses and cyclists, so that these become attractive alternatives. Heavy private vehicle use creates dangerous conditions for cyclists and pedestrians. Separated bicycle lanes should be a priority.

c) There are 2 benefits to ending old-growth logging, which is not covered in the action plan. At the moment, timber is exported as a low-value product, because native forest logging prevents Forest Stewardship Council accreditation. Our timber will eventually become a stranded asset as other countries move to more sustainable options. At the same time, ending native forest logging would reduce the carbon emissions from the logging process and regeneration burns. This would also reduce smoke exposure to local communities. The move to increased plantation timber is welcome, though there needs to be more consideration to the eucalypt species planted. While *E. nitens* is the plantation species of choice for its rapid growth and insect resistance, it is not suitable for the building industry. Reliance on a single species is short-sighted.

d) The reliance on our native forests as a carbon sink is flawed. Wardlaw (2021) showed that wet sclerophyll forests become net carbon emitters, rather than carbon sinks, after several days of high temperatures, an increasingly likely situation with climate change. We need to do much more to reduce actual emissions rather than relying on offsets

Wardlaw, Tim. 2021. "Measuring a Fire. The Story of the January 2019 Fire Told from Measurements at the Warra Supersite, Tasmania" *Fire* 4, no. 2: 15.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/fire4020015>

2. Will the three priority areas -
- (1) information and knowledge
 - (2) transition and innovation and
 - (3) adaptation and resilience, help Tasmania achieve its legislated 2030 emissions reduction target, and its vision for action on climate change?
- Are there other issues not covered by the three priority areas?

While Tasmania shows a net zero carbon budget, this assumes that all our electricity is renewable, when in fact at any time of the day, we could be importing coal or gas-fired power via the National Energy Market. Tasmania should be working towards reducing electricity demand

3. Will the key actions under Priority area 1 help support decision making for you and your community or organisation? What types of projects should be supported under the final action plan?

Further research and communication is only valuable if this is based on scientific studies and taken on board by the government under legislated targets. The science is clear - there should be no more coal or gas developments, but lobby groups continue to have a strong influence on government decisions.

4. Will the key actions under Priority area 2 support Tasmania to achieve its 2030 emissions reduction target and continued emissions reduction across Tasmania? What types of projects should be supported under the final action plan?

a) In October 2022, all states and territories, other than Tasmania, ratified the updated National Construction Code, which mandated a move to 7 star housing. This was rejected by the Minister for Housing. At the moment, Tasmania has a very poor standard of housing, with many poorly insulation and oriented homes, which increases the need for heating and cooling, and increases electricity demands and the cost to households. It is unfortunate that the current Tas housing standard of 6-star housing is assessed at the planning stage, and not as constructed. This means that many new homes are not performing as well as they should, many at only 3- 4 stars. The large volume builders have too much influence on government policy. This decision should be reversed and not left until 2025 for consideration

b) Much of the social housing stock was constructed before high insulation standards and high efficiency heating and hot water appliances were common. There should be a strong emphasis on updating the public housing stock to improve resident comfort and health, and reduce energy costs (and electricity demand).

b) Strong financial support is needed to help low-income households install insulation, heat pumps or efficient hot water systems. The high initial cost prevents many households improving their homes. Extension of the no-interest loan scheme, with more effective and targeted advertising would help with this.

5. Will the key actions under Priority area 3 build resilience and support adaptation planning across Tasmania? What types of projects should be supported under the final action plan?

Climate change will increase the frequency and intensity of natural disasters, such as floods, severe storms and wildfire. More and more homes are becoming uninsurable.

a) There should be a strong emphasis on revegetating riparian zones to reduce the impact of floods, and financial incentives for people to move away from flood plains to higher ground.

b) Fire-fighting resources are poorly funded and rely heavily on volunteers.

Major investment should be made in fire-fighting technology, employment and equipment. This should include rapid-response equipment to extinguish fires in remote areas and the World Heritage Area before irreparable damage is done to sensitive vegetation. The attitude of "let it burn, it will reduce the fuel load" is outdated and dangerous.

c) Look after the health of our rivers. Most of our rivers are now dammed for irrigation - they are heavily degraded. There should be stronger emphasis on matching agricultural productivity to climatic and soil conditions, rather than the current "add water and it will grow" attitude.

6. Are there other ways the government could make its action on climate change, and progress towards meeting its targets, more transparent and accessible?

a) Better urban planning to make public transport more efficient.

b) More dedicated cycle ways

c) End native forest logging

d) No new coal or gas developments

e) Reduce barriers to solar PV installations. At the same time, there needs to be oversight of installers, and barriers to prevent unqualified installers operating.

f) New renewable energy projects should be for the benefit of all Tasmanians, not multinational companies. Woolnorth is an example of a project funded by taxpayers and then sold off into overseas hands. This should never happen.

g) Transparency should include publication of political donations over \$1000 in real time, not years after the event. This would limit the ability of carbon-intensive industries to influence the political process.

h) Carbon-intensive industries should be forced to reduce emissions and not rely on questionable carbon offsets.

7. If you have any further questions or feedback please add it here

8. Please provide your full name, or the name of your organisation *

Dr Anne Watson, BSc (Hons) PhD

9. Please provide your email address (optional)

10. Do you give permission for the Climate Change Office to publish your submission? *

Yes

No