

INDIVIDUAL

SUBMISSION (four A4 pages) from

Mrs. Rosemary Farrell

provided as emailed attachment on 28 April 2021

to ConsultationTasmania@jacobs.com

relevant to

NET ZERO EMISSIONS PATHWAY OPTIONS FOR TASMANIA

Background Paper

for

Tasmanian Department of Premier and Cabinet

dated 19 March 2021

by

Point Advisory

with

Indufor

The Climate Change Act & State Government response to climate change

1. To what extent should climate change considerations (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, climate change impacts, climate resilience) influence policies and decisions by State government agencies and government business enterprises? **To the greatest extent possible, particularly with regard to biodiversity issues in :-**
 - a) **ALL industrial native forest logging - native forest accessible to STT, plantations and private forest;**
 - b) **industrial fish farms in any sensitive or restorable marine environment;**
 - c) **tourism infrastructure AROUND (but never IN) World Heritage Areas, as these are biodiverse on a world scale and in Tasmania are simply irreplaceable.**
2. How important is it to you that the Tasmanian government systematically assess and disclose the main risks associated with projected climate change? **Essential. The Tasmanian government is the custodian on OUR behalf - not for their own personal or political interests or that of commercial business interests, which may be present or future donors – of OUR biodiverse rich land and marine heritage.**
3. How might the Act provide you with confidence that successive State governments will continue to act to contain/reduce Tasmania's emissions and build climate resilience? **ONLY if all political donations above \$1000 are disclosed to the public PRIOR to each new election. VOTER TRUST has been worn threadbare, especially in regard to all MAJORITY State governments.. Donations should be disallowed one week prior to an election with a cut-off date prior to that, so that they become public information. We know that political electoral corruption is rampant in Tasmania and so need THIS Act to be sincerely drawn up and executed.**

Also some data, especially in this Background Paper, is "hidden" – possibly deliberately - and has been for decades. Agriculture and Forestry (LULUCF !!) must become separate government departments once more – not merged to camouflage employment and GHG emission statistics. It is interesting that insufficient statistics are available to compare the two sectors. For instance :- in Fig 2 on page 5, where (Policy Drivers) declares that "the scale of production from the agriculture sector is expected to significantly increase between now and 2050, which may increase emissions" BUT (Economic Drivers) declares that "Sustainable Timber Tasmania projections ... will stay at a similar level" WHILE "Tasmania's GHG profile by sector in 2018" would seem to indicate the LULUCF was responsible for minus 10,000 emissions compared to Agriculture's 2,000 plus.

How can such statistics (and these are out of date now) be compared? ALSO what IS Agriculture, if it is not LU (Land Use) and/or LUC (Land Use Change)? Therefore the acronym LULUCF seems to intentionally mislead at a time that statistics are vital for scientifically – not politically – measuring GHG emissions. The concept behind LULUCF must be completely overhauled prior to the passing of the Climate Change Act and a new Background Paper should be prepared for another round of public submissions – especially since this "sector" in the current Background Paper seems set to CONTINUE (?) to do so much (TOO MUCH?) heavy lifting towards Tasmania's mitigation of Climate Change between now and 2050 whilst continuing as Business As Usual (BAU) and still without Forest Stewardship Certification.

It appears that pages 7 and 8 of the Background Paper by Point Advisory is heavily biased towards the continuation of Gutwein Liberal government and Minister Barnett's industrial native forest focus.

4. How might the Act drive further de-carbonisation of the Tasmanian economy (e.g. via setting/legislating targets for sectors of the economy, potentially including interim targets)? **BY JUST THAT - legislating targets and then measuring, accounting and comparing these in a transparent way - for sectors of the economy, under the supervision of biologists, other scientists, accountants and data specialists – NOT politicians. Interim targets are essential and the same should apply to them.**

5. If the Act were to espouse principles that would guide consideration of climate change by government, its agencies and business enterprises, what might they be? **HONESTY, and the education of every sitting member of parliament in ETHICS and LIFE SCIENCES by experts - because the smallest effect on biodiversity ANYWHERE in the state is key – yet biodiversity has not been mentioned once in this Paper. Neither have the words environment, habitat or ecology. Only then can our State parliament improve its proper oversight following years of inadequacy, ignorance and exploitation.**

Global Climate Action & Tasmania

6. Within the context of global agreements to action and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, what do you consider to be the main roles of the Tasmanian government and how effective do you believe the government has been? **Their effectiveness has been poor at best. In relation to Tasmanian World Heritage Areas and the TRUE value of our natural resources, the Tasmanian government should feel ashamed of past attitudes and actions - with the possible exception our two previous MINORITY State governments where a broader, more "conservative" range of thinking has been welcomed by the general community. The main role of the Tasmanian government should now be one of genuine concern about the threats of Climate Change and their need to grasp the chance offered to bring about real and meaningful changes of ATTITUDE to Tasmania's natural values, of which they are TEMPORARY custodians, and to the Tasmanian community and future generations.**
7. What would Tasmania be like in 10 years' time if it was a national or international leader in climate change responses? **Tasmania COULD be a world icon, under coming Premiers. Thank goodness for some Legislative Councillors acting as a break on controlling and exploitative proposed legislation such as the Interim Planning Directive (IPD), designed to weaken democratic involvement of its voters, local councils and communities. This current legislation should be abandoned.**
8. **Emission Targets** What would you consider to be an appropriate long-term greenhouse gas emissions or emissions reduction target for Tasmania (in terms of date and level of emissions or emissions reduction)? **Zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2035. Page 4 of the Background paper states : "With its significant forest estate and low carbon electricity sector Tasmania is well placed among Australian states and territories(and) achieve and maintain zero net emission earlier than 2050 largely influenced by the LULUCF sector maintaining removals at levels largely aligned with those seen over the past five years." That is why the projected "opportunities" for LULUCF on page 7 need to be reformulated as follows :-**
- #"Reduce conversion of plantations to other land uses following plantation harvesting" by regenerating the native species previously removed statewide. These will provide a LARGE emission reduction. Co-benefits - a) "ongoing revenue from increased" carbon capture and future emissions trading schemes (ETS). b) "Diversification of revenue streams for private landowners from carbon credits." c) Local JOBS.**
 - #"Increased plantation(s)" ROTATION (as opposed to creation) and end whole log export. Co-benefits – a) "Ongoing revenue from increased sales of hardwood and softwood plantations logs" for local building construction. b) "Revenue from increased sales of domestic wood products" locally for building and manufacturing. (This will require research and development of new technologies to be once again sought to enable the high value use of plantation wood) c) as is.**
 - #Decreased "proportion of forestry" carefully selected native wood to "go to long term ... domestic" high value skilled local artisan production. Co-benefits – as is.**
 - #"Introduce measures to reduce the risk of major bushfires" Co-benefits – as is.**
- With regard to the Stationary energy , emission reduction opportunities ALL woodchip exports should end and woodchip mills should all be closed as these must no longer drive industrial logging of any**

kind AND industrial bioenergy production from wood products must not be contemplated as this would become a driver of further industrial logging for export. These WILL NOT REDUCE EMISSIONS.

9. What (if any) value do you think targets for specific sectors of the economy would offer, including for the sector itself? If you agree with the concept of sectoral emissions targets, which sectors should have emissions targets? Why? **State and private plantation based FORESTRY must be the main sector provided with emission targets. All hot-regeneration burning should immediately cease and ALL native forests and ecosystems, including current and future native wood production zones exited for good by this state-subsidised industry (see 8 above);**

MINING should also be a sector specifically targeted for emissions reduction;

INDUSTRIAL SALMON FISHING and FARMING in our rivers and off our coasts, should have strict emission targets set as soon as possible, and significantly increased regulation. This industry should be subject to rigorous reduction of SCALE and brought INLAND and onto current non-forested land. Native marine species and habitat needs to be urgently rehabilitated, and funded by the three current operators of this TOXIC export industry in consultation with bio-marine scientists.

SHOOTERS, when a strict program of regulation is in place, should be permitted to take feral deer for domestic small scale commercial purposes, so that consumers can be encouraged to move away from beef and sheep consumption. Deer farmers should be compensated by the government and closed. When the feral deer resource is finally eliminated, the "farming" of native animals for the table can be undertaken, as a much healthier source of protein for humans. This will reduce emissions enormously and be another opportunity to reduce bushfire risk - by "growing" a regenerated native forest estate - relative to pasture which requires large scale watering. Fire and weed management involved in establishing regenerated-native-forest habitat for selected-native-fauna-farming production estates on public land can - after full consultation with local Aboriginal communities and their possible commercial involvement - provide a new LOW EMISSION, carefully regulated, not-for-export, industry and local JOBS. Native duck shooting should be abandoned for the time being.

10. What key factors should influence Government decisions to set State, sectoral and/or interim targets? **Members of the government (employed as well as elected) should always be influenced by their sense of responsibility for their own children, grandchildren and later descendants, and this concern should extend to the whole all Tasmanian community. This ultimate, sustainable SELF INTEREST should motivate our politicians and be promoted by their voters. Education will be a critical factor. The first paragraph of page 3 of this Background Paper makes this clear. The philosophy behind the State Government's response to Climate Change should be in terms of a net zero emissions pathway for TasmaniaTHINK GLOBALLY (re GHG emissions) – ACT LOCALLY.**

Low Carbon & Economy & Society

11. What do you consider to be the main risks and opportunities for Tasmania as it continues to transition towards a low/zero carbon economy and society? What risks and opportunities may arise if Tasmania transitions more slowly/more rapidly? **The main risk is a continuation of voting for head-in-the-sand, arrogant and secretive majority governments which make a speciality of rubber stamping the greed and aspirations of specific commercial interests over and above the community which they represent. This will CERTAINLY slow transition towards a low/zero carbon economy, and a healthy and more equal society. The protection and regeneration of our unique biodiverse natural environments must now be paramount. Then the opportunities for Tasmanians are endless and the risks decrease. Point Advisory states, in their page 9 summary :- "Our analysis showed that the transition to a net zero carbon economy could deliver ECONOMIC BENEFITS across most sectors, including agriculture, forestry and aquaculture, and manufacturing."**

12. What do you consider to be the main roles for State government in supporting Tasmania's low/zero carbon transition? **HONESTY and HUMILITY and allowing concerned and educated citizens to be heard - instead of threatened with arrest, fines and imprisonment for trying to prevent destructive and frequently uneconomic trends. Tasmanians CARE - and Tasmanian aboriginal populations were the CAREtakers of lutrawita Tasmania - which they looked after, managed, modified and made productive without destroying - for well over 40,000 years. Their abuse, murder and institutionalisation has stood in the way of the appreciation, by settler populations, of their successful survival and their evolving economy prior to 1803 - and later, in many parts whilst they remained undisturbed..... HONESTY and HUMILITY should now be the main roles for our government. In supporting lutrawita Tasmania's low/zero carbon transition.**
13. **Climate Resilience & Adaption.** What do you consider to be the main roles for State government in supporting Tasmanian communities, infrastructure, economic activities and environments in becoming more resilient to projected climate change? **Putting in place of ALL of the ABOVE measures - plus the suggested modification of pages 7 and 8 (see the heading Emission Targets).**

SUBMISSION (four A4 pages) from

Mrs. Rosemary Farrell