Darwin – Justin Tutty

Please be advised that this transcript was produced from a video recording. As such, the quality and accuracy of this transcript cannot be guaranteed and the Inquiry is not liable for any errors.

2 August 2017

Darwin Convention Centre, Darwin

Speaker: Justin Tutty

Justin Tutty: My name's Justin Tutty. I'm a local resident.

Hon. Justice Rachel Pepper: Thank you. Yes, go ahead Mister Tutty.

Justin Tutty: Yeah, well thanks again for all your work. It's going really well, I reckon. I'm really enjoying it. I've really enjoyed today following the proceedings, and I thank you for the interim report. I've been learning a lot through this process. You'll remember, we met before and I described to you that I see the climate risks and impacts of fracking in the NT is an outright disqualification. I want to recommend that it should be absolutely rejected.

Hon. Justice Rachel Pepper: Mister Tutty, I do need to just make it abundantly clear that we have no mandate and you will never find in any report that we issue a recommendation to the government the moratorium be lifted or stay. That is absolutely the belly work of the government, not us.

Justin Tutty: I did also enjoy that discussion previously about future DEF emissions, like I can see how you've been grappling with this as have some of the participants in the process. I appreciate that you've taken on a lot of new information. I've recognised that your burdened with certain expectations about somehow divining ways to mitigate, manage, monitor, report these kind of new risks, things that people haven't dealt with very well before. While I'm not satisfied at all, I appreciate the good work that you're doing, the important work that you're doing. What I don't really appreciate from the interim report is all that discussion about coal. I thought we had a good exchange last time.

I wrote you a letter. I gave you resources, and I just don't understand why your interim report talks about coal. I wonder whether you could shed light on that. I wonder if there's a misunderstanding. Is there something I missed?

Hon. Justice Rachel Pepper: Mister Tutty, this is your opportunity to present to us. This is not to a dialogue today. If you wish to get involved in a two way dialogue, then I

would urge you to come to one of our community forums where that type of interaction can take place. This is your opportunity to present us with information today. Thank you.

Justin Tutty: I had a similar opportunity before where I believed I gave you good, sensible, logical information about why it was ridiculous to be comparing the threat of anti-frack to gas to coal. I don't understand why you're continuing to make that comparison. I don't understand why the sensible logic I presented to you previously is not evident in your interim report. I call upon you to have another look at what I've given you already. I invite you to consider whether you can defend the nonsense that you've written comparing gas to coal. No one should be using coal now. No one should be using gas now. I think someone said previously today that if the best you can say about this threat is that it might be better than coal, it's got nothing to go for it.

I would like to refer to one particular sentence from your interim report and try to share with you my disgust. "For a gas fill producing a thousand terajoules per day of gas where all of this additional natural gas displaces coal from electricity production in Australia, then our greenhouse gas savings are some 26 megatons year to over year. Five percent of Australia's greenhouse gas emission infantry ... " We don't use coal in the NT. My understanding is that all these frackers want to export as fast as possible to the first available buyer. I'm not aware of any structure that lets us imagine that this gas might be displacing coal in Australia. I described that to you last time, and I see no evidence in your report that there might be. Similarly, I'm not aware of any international structure that might give us any confidence that quickly ripped up and exported anti-fracked gas may be displacing coal anywhere in the world.

I urge you to consider from a risk management perspective the likelihood that anti-fracked gas would be exploited in addition to rather than displacing coal. Perhaps by locking in new gasified pass stations, it would be perversely displacing the likelihood of cleaner, sustainable, long-term renewable alternatives. I encourage you to give greater consideration to the risk of displacing cleaner technologies than the unfounded fantasy of displacing dirty coal. I think you've heard if not discussion then maybe reference today about the fellow in the suit was talking about when we'd get all the money, when we get all the jobs, when we'd see this bonanza middle of next decade.

I encourage you to consider the likely status of renewable industries, technologies by the middle of next decade. Personally, I'm thinking deeply about whether there might be great economic benefit in addition to the obvious environmental benefit of sitting back for those ten years. I think there might be greater financial benefit, economic benefit, jobs in addition to the obvious environmental benefit of a livable climate to come from holding on to the likelihood of effective renewable displacement of all fossil

fuels rather than clinging to this fancy order of gas displacing coal. I think that's all I have for you today.

I mean, there was much I'd like to explore. It's so entertaining. It's so interesting and enjoyable, but what I want you to do for me is to lose this nonsense about coal and think more seriously about the risk of gas displacing solar.

Hon. Justice Rachel Pepper: Thank you very much Mister Tutty. Any questions? Yes, Dr. Beck.

Dr Vaughan Beck AM: I'm going to make some observations.

Justin Tutty: Okay.

Dr Vaughan Beck AM: Thanks very much for your comments on Chapter Nine. In terms of putting some context around some of the comments that you've made, I'll just note that, I think it's in Table 9.1, where there are estimates made initially as to what that a thousand terajoule per day would represent in gross additions to the greenhouse gas inventory for Australia without considering what use the gas was put to. I think in the report, there is probably effectively two scenarios. One is just total gas supply of 1,000 terajoules per day, and that represents about five percent I think of Australia's greenhouse gas emissions without taking into account any consideration of how that gas would be used.

There's a second entry there, I think it's 3,400 terajoules, where there is an allowance for gas to be ... I think it might be 80%, I need to check. 80% would be used for export and 20% would be used for domestic application. In taking to account the 80%, then allowances made for the emissions that arise from the actual compression of the gas and the transport of the gas to an overseas market. There is those considerations there. That's phase one of the considerations, trying to get an estimate of what the total gross load would be. Then in looking at what might be the net load in terms of ... you have to look at potential applications for gas.

In terms of gas, there are many potential applications. It ranges from possible electricity generation. It includes domestic use for both space heating and cooking. It includes commercial use for similar reasons, and it includes industrial use, which could be for process or .. There are multiple potential uses of gas in the marketplace from domestic through to industrial through to electricity. In terms of taking one particular one of those spectrum, we did then say, "Okay, now let's look at the comparison if all of that gas was used for replacement of coal." Now, one can mount an argument that that may not be necessarily the case, but it was one way of at least trying to characterise what would be the net result.

This then, it looks at the net result of greenhouse gases should there be substitution for coal versus the application of gas. As I've noted previously

here in terms of electricity generation, then there can be considerations that I mentioned before in terms of that a Finkel reporter did look at the interplay between the various forms of renewable energies and fossil fuels and on the data that was available. Now, the application of gas did fall from six percent to three percent from 2022, 2035. I'm just trying to put some of the work of that Chapter Nine into context and to response to some of the observations that you made.

Justin Tutty: Thank you. Yeah, I did read the whole chapter.

Dr Vaughan Beck AM: Yeah.

Justin Tutty: Yeah, I'm aware there are other uses for gas than producing electricity. I guess I used to be open to that, less and less over time. I'm just here today focusing on that bit of nonsense, which really just displeased me. I don't see any place for that analysis in your work. It did cause me to think, "Why are we not worrying about the more significant and likely risk of actually displacing better energy alternatives?"

Hon. Justice Rachel Pepper: Noted. Thank you very much.