



Tasmanian Climate Collective Submission to the draft Transport Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plan

[Tasmanian Climate Collective](#) (TCC) offers this submission in our ongoing efforts to support the copious, overwhelming scientific advice regarding the necessary actions required to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

TCC is a group of committed organisations and individuals from across lutruwita, Tasmania who advocate for evidence based action on climate change. The Collective is made up of climate action, social and environmental groups and grassroots organisations. Tasmanian Climate Collective has no political affiliation and is composed of scientists, farmers, doctors, teachers, nurses and other concerned citizens calling for more action on climate change and a just transition for all Tasmanians.

TCC makes numerous submissions to inquiries such as this in our efforts to improve the chance of a safe, healthy and fair Tasmania. As a 100% volunteer run organisation, this takes many hours from many people. Even then, our submissions compete with those made by paid employees and lobbyists of powerful industries with vested interests. The David vs Goliath nature of our efforts takes a huge toll on our volunteers who would rather be giving their time to other causes, such as schools, sports, community care, etc. The excessive influence of lobbyists, political donors and powerful industries with vested interests currently prevents politicians and decision makers from acting on the best advice of independent experts in the interests of all Tasmanians. Before we address the consultation questions, we would like to make a single clear recommendation:

Recommendation: Politicians and other decision makers in the Tasmanian government should directly consult independent scientific experts, act on their advice and adequately resource implementation.

[Tasmanians](#) are concerned about climate change and looking for more ambitious, sector based climate policies. The failure of successive governments to act on the best scientific advice, has left Tasmanians with worsening climate and ecological crises. Tasmania's current climate and energy transition policies do not yet reflect the advice of [climate scientists](#) and [policy experts](#).

Tasmania has been [plagued by concerns](#) about excessive influence of powerful vested interests. Tasmanians are [increasingly concerned](#) about our democratic processes and this is becoming a [major political issue](#).

The role of TCC and other concerned citizens should not be to provide expert evidence based advice. Our role is to demand that the Tasmanian government listen to and act on the advice of independent scientific experts, rather than the advice of high greenhouse gas emitters and their industry associations. In a properly functioning democracy, where decision makers have not been "captured" by vested interests, our role should be redundant.

With the above recommendation in mind, TCC strongly supports the excellent submissions made by:

- [Climate Tasmania](#)
- Sustainable Living Tasmania/Circular Economy Huon/Net Zero Channel
- TCC member, Jenny Cambers-Smith.

The expert advice in these submissions is invaluable and if acted upon, will ensure a better quality of life for all Tasmanians.

TCC's role is to support and amplify the advice of organisations and members such as these, rather than 'reinvent their wheel'. We are grateful to be able to use their expertise to make representations to decision makers.

When collating the responses in this consultation, please consider that TCC members and [member groups](#) support the recommendations in the aforementioned submissions.

How can we build on the work already underway to reduce emissions and build resilience in the transport sector?

It is clear from the advice of Climate Tasmania and the Tasmanian Policy Exchange, that Tasmania needs:

- A legislated, more ambitious transport sector emissions reduction target with more progress indicators.
- Electrification of private, public and commercial transport as soon as possible.
- Detailed targets with timelines, measurable progress indicators and accountability frameworks for all measures listed in the draft ERRP. Qualitative terms such as "support", "increase", "consider" and "explore", etc. must be replaced with quantitative measures to achieve meaningful change.
- An ambitious target for reduction of private vehicle reliance and measures to meet it, including public and active transport, and remote working.
- Policies that include social equity measures that will reduce the transport energy costs for vulnerable Tasmanians.

TCC supports the emissions reduction measures in the draft Transport ERRP, while acknowledging that they do not go far enough. To meet community expectations of climate policies through implementation of these important measures, the Tasmanian government must properly fund and resource them in a whole of government approach. This cannot be overstated. Failure to properly fund good intentions, fails the Tasmanian community.

***The changes required to mitigate and adapt to the climate crisis are beyond the breadth and scale of previous human experience.
They must be resourced accordingly.***

In addition to supporting the above submissions, we offer a community perspective here. We are mindful that Tasmania has a high regional population, a significant amount of social disadvantage and a strong connection to the life support systems in our environment. We trust this inquiry to prioritise the interests of all Tasmanians over those of powerful vested interests.

In the current cost of living crisis, it is important to highlight the substantial co benefits of more ambitious transport emissions reductions. Since Tasmania relies on imported transport fuels, we are vulnerable to [price increases](#) and global supply shocks with [only weeks of fuel stocked locally](#).

Transport energy prices have an enormous impact on Tasmanian households, businesses and industries. Many of the measures that will reduce GHG emissions have the potential to dramatically improve transport equity. Transport equity is a key target of the UN Sustainable Development Goals that Tasmania has committed to.

As stated in the Tasmanian Policy Exchange [“Driving net-zero”](#) technical policy paper, active transport, electric vehicle uptake and changes in employment arrangements “*offers the best mix of impact, cost and technological readiness*” that will benefit Tasmanians across socioeconomic groups.

What future opportunities do you think will have the most impact?

A key value of TCC is to be “informed and guided by science”, so what we think is always determined by the best evidence based scientific advice.

We entirely support the Climate Tasmania priorities and see no need to reproduce them here.

As representative of many community climate action groups across Tasmania, TCC would like to see the social equity principle as a core consideration in the final Transport ERRP.

TCC are particularly passionate about the enormous employment and other economic opportunities inherent in Tasmania switching from imported fuels to local renewable electricity. We recommend that infrastructure involved in this transition is “done with the community, for the benefit of the community - not to the community” (Helen Haines MP).

We would like to make special mention of the future opportunities in a public education campaign. It is important that the Tasmanian government lead public education to correct the ongoing misinformation that is so widely accepted. The award winning “Curious Climate” team, or similar, is desperately needed to educate Tasmanians about climate, threats and solutions.

The areas of necessary public education include:

- Clear, simple explanation of the threats, risks and timeframes of climate impacts, required mitigation and adaptations
- Clear, simple messaging about active, public and electric transport, its importance and the co-benefits
- Clear, accessible information about electric vehicles to dispel EV myths. For example, this letter (Debunking EV facts) to the editor of the Advocate was published on 26 Nov, 2023. The level of ignorance displayed in this letter is common among the community.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

State needs to keep ownership of our energy

FEAR OVER OVERALL LOSS FROM PROJECT

Mayor Teeny Brumby rightly wants more local jobs. Sadly, she's believed corporate and political spin that 'jobs and growth' will flow from new transmission.

But our mountain valley community, having been fighting off TasNetworks' proposed new grid for four years, know better.

I believe if stage two is allowed, we'll suffer job losses in tourism, property values will drop, farms will be divided, fire risks will soar, and wild forests and catchments will be permanently damaged.

We'll pay for TasNetworks' 'investment' via taxes, state debt and power bills. I believe any construction jobs will be 80-90 percent FIFO.

Post-construction, there'll be few jobs in highly-automated hydrogen or bitcoin mining factories. "eFuel" isn't 'clean' or 'green', and the power and profits all go offshore.

The energy sector, I believe, is a mess because our government's plan for foreign investors, not Tasmania.

Please Mayor listen to the communities when we beg governments to hear us and plan for us. We need to own and keep Tasmanian energy for our needs, not theirs.

Ben Marshall, Loongana

DEBUNKING SOME EV 'FACTS'

I believe Flynn McConnell's letter contains several errors (Adv., Nov 22).

He states that "our transport emissions have not significantly reduced for 30 years".

This is not true: I drive a mid-sized SUV that returns 7.6 - 7.7 l/100k. Thirty years ago it would have been double that.

He goes on to say that "most of us still rely on dirty, expensive imported petrol and diesel that is 100 percent imported and vulnerable to global shocks."

Most modern cars are clean to drive and

20 percent of all our petrol and diesel is produced here in Australia.

He further says, "We'd all be much better off using home grown Tas renewable electricity to get around."

The problem with this idea is that we only have enough electricity for our current demand and would have to increase by about 50 percent of our our electricity generation to meet the increased demand.

Does Mr McConnell want to see many more wind farms and overhead transmission lines around the State to meet this increased demand?

He makes a good point when he says, "Our public transport could be electrified and made cheaper." This is because EVs lend themselves to lots of stop start driving. He also says, "I also ask *The Advocate* readers to internet search for "debunking EV myths."

I also would like to debunk a few myths about EVs.

1. EVs are not practical: it takes 1 and 1/2 hours to fully charge an EV from empty. I have heard of people waiting three hours to get their EVs charged, as the charging station was occupied.
2. They are a fire hazard and once started the fires cannot be put out.
3. They are extremely heavy and carry an enormous amount of momentum such that in the event of a front on collision they do enormous damage to the other vehicle and, as well, usually catch fire.
4. There are nowhere near sufficient charging stations to make them viable.
5. They cost approximately twice as much as Internal combustion engines to purchase.
6. The batteries need replacing after approximately 10 years and this costs approximately 30-40% of a new EV.
7. Range starts to diminish from the day it is

purchased.

8. Disposal of the used batteries in a major problem.

9. The main manufacturer of EVs is China, and they source most of their lithium from Africa where child labour is used to source the lithium.

Is it any wonder then, that sales of EVs in this country are plummeting?

John Fry, Port Sorell

SENATOR'S COMMENTS CHALLENGED

Queensland senator Matt Canavan has recently said that Australia should not offer residents of low-lying Pacific islands such as Tuvalu settlement in this country, even though their islands will be rendered uninhabitable from rising sea levels in the near future.

His climate change refugee precedent is duly noted.

As the world is on track for catastrophic levels of warming by mid-century; which will really start to bite at two degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels; a lot of Queenslanders will be wanting to move south to leave the atrocious heat, drought, floods and cyclones that will no doubt plague their state over the coming decades.

One study suggests that there will be one million homes across Australia that will be uninsurable in only seven years time.

Tasmania will be no doubt be under intense pressure to accommodate the influx of people searching for cooler climes.

So careful be Mr Canavan, your heartless cruelty to the people of Tuvalu may come back to bite you when your own family or constituents are looking to head towards Tasmania in search of fairer weather.

You wouldn't want us Tasmanians to follow your own cruel precedent now would you?

Jack Gray, Spreyton

Are there any priorities or future opportunities missing from this draft plan?

While we have listed the TCC concerns above, the main omissions include:

- Ambitious actions and targets commensurate with the urgency and severity of the climate crisis and the level of emissions reduction required.
- Specified transport sector targets with ongoing progress tracking and reporting
- Details of resourcing and implementation
- Commitments to prioritise scientific advice and community wellbeing above vested interests in industry
- Consideration of the Tasmanian Policy Exchange suggestion of a revenue neutral, means tested ZEV subsidy scheme
- A stated shift away from the “one more lane will fix it” transport plan towards a more sustainable integrated transport system.
- An explicit statement that precludes the use of offsets for any transport emissions.
- Realistic information on the minimal role of hydrogen in low emissions transport solutions. The [hydrogen hype](#) needs to be called out as the public get a greater understanding of the need for green hydrogen use to be limited to the manufacture of fertilisers and steel and some heavy transport.
- Reference to the contentious role of biofuels in emissions reduction. We are very concerned to see that consultation with business and industry want to “*increase the use of biofuels as an alternative fuel source for internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles*” While this may have been a reasonable transition option decades ago, it is no longer viable. The urgency and degree of emissions reduction, as well as sequestration levels required preclude biofuels as a sufficient mitigation measure. Organic matter (biofuel feedstock) is more valuable in sequestration, than burning.

Are there other ways we can collaborate to reduce emissions and build resilience in the transport sector?

Collaborate with scientific experts more than vested interests.

Collaboration with industry needs to acknowledge that the top priority is the necessary emissions reduction for the benefit of all current and future Tasmanians. The current situation seems to prioritise interests of industries that benefit from delaying more ambitious climate policies.

Tasmania is in the unique position of housing the world's most climate active university. The University of Tasmania also has a strong community engagement ethos. TCC would like to see our communities benefit more from stronger government relationships with UTas. These relationships need some level of formal recognition to avoid staff overwork and burnout. UTas

support combined with the Climate Change Office, has the potential to make Tasmania a true climate leader.

Collaboration with traditional and new media is necessary to elevate climate expertise above the current and previous misinformation.

To ensure social equity in the final Transport ERRP, TCC would like to see the Tasmanian government collaborate with TasCOSS and other members of the community welfare sector.

Thank you for considering this submission. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these matters further in the interest of strengthening Tasmania's Transport ERRP.

Tasmanian Climate Collective

www.tasclimatecollective.org

We acknowledge the traditional owners of lutruwita, the Palawa, their ongoing custodianship of the land, community, sea and waters.

We pay our deepest respect to Palawa elders, past and present.

Sovereignty was never ceded. Always was, always will be Aboriginal land