

---

**From:** Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:18 AM  
**To:** Jason Humphreys  
**Subject:** FW: information as discussed  
**Attachments:** SB position on transition.pdf; Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G`morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point.

Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M /MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

SB (CFMEU), comments for Industry assistance for 50/50 coal fired power reduction, which will affect Generators and the Coal Mine supplier.

1. Ongoing Full time employment for all displaced Mining and Power workers.
2. Recognition on current LSL accruals, and conditions (qualifying period, level of payment, how and when it is able to be accessed etc.),
3. Relocation expenses, including grants to assist with the costs of changing schooling, partners having to give up work to move with the main “bread winner”.
4. Training subsidies for individuals, to be available up to 12 months from the date of being displaced in a field of their choosing and which will assist in securing ongoing and permanent employment,
5. Small Business Loans/Grants, low interest packages for affected employees,
6. Assistance for Communities who loose residents due to Station/Mine shut-downs. e.g. assistance packages for small businesses and public utilities/services who are adversely impacted by the reduction in population
7. Housing - do Government purchase houses off employees who have to relocate,  
- low interest loans for house purchases for employees who have had to relocate,
8. Increased funds for Social Services to assist with the pressures of losing employment, e.g. suicide prevention programs, child support group.
9. Incentives to employers to “take on” anyone affected with losing their job because of shutdowns, especially if there is a re-training requirement for a new employees.
10. “Top up” payments to employees superannuation funds who were nearing retirement age and have had to leave the industry prematurely due to Government Policy.

#### Other issues

1. A detailed Study into the economic and social impacts on the Community after any closure, some issues that will require investigation Schools, Hospital, Policing and social services funding/manning when large numbers leave a Community, e.g. if a mine and generator closes in the community e.g. Kogan, Tarong the effects on the Communities of Chinchilla and Kingaroy would be devastating.

# **CFMEU**

**Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union**

**Australia's Climate Policy Options**

**Submission to the  
Climate Change Authority**

**February 2016**

This response has been prepared and submitted  
on the basis that it is a public document.

Submitted to the:

Climate Change Authority  
GPO Box 1944  
Melbourne VIC 3001

By email: [submissions@climatechangeauthority.gov.au](mailto:submissions@climatechangeauthority.gov.au)

Submitted by:

**Michael O'Connor**

National Secretary

Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union

148-152 Miller St

West Melbourne VIC 3003

Tel: (03) 9274 9200

Fax: (03) 9274 9284

Email: Contrary to Public Interest - personal information

Website: [www.cfmeu.org.au](http://www.cfmeu.org.au)

## Overview

The CFMEU is one of Australia's largest trade unions, and represents workers in heavy industry, including in the emissions-intensive sectors of coal mining and power generation.

We accept the need for major restructuring across Australia, including in the power generation industry, as part of necessary efforts to mitigate climate change.

However, that acceptance is contingent on climate policy fully addressing the social costs associated with major industry restructuring. While Australian society and the economy as a whole may experience little loss from strong climate policy, it is very clear that certain industries and regions, and the communities associated with them, will be hit hard.

A key outcome of the December 2015 COP21 Paris Agreement on climate is "Just Transition" for workers and communities affected both by climate change and by policies dealing with climate change.

This submission largely confines itself to that issue, and urges that the Climate Change Authority integrate it into its policy development.

While there is reference to equity as one of the guiding principles for the CCA's work, this is not focussed on the impacts on particular regions that are already known to be "in the firing line" in climate policy.

Australia has a poor track record in Labour Adjustment Programs. Generally they are too little, too late. An after-thought rather than an up-front policy priority.

*The CFMEU urges the CCA to not repeat that mistake.*

## Introduction

The Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union welcomes the opportunity to make a brief submission responding to the Second Draft Report of the Climate Change Authority .

The CFMEU consists of three Divisions, namely the Mining and Energy Division, the Forestry and Furnishing Products Division and the Construction and General Division. We are the major union in these industries and represent approximately 110,000 members across Australia.

The CFMEU Mining and Energy Division has the overwhelming majority of its members employed in coal mining and power generation and is therefore always concerned about energy policy and regulatory frameworks.

The agreed need to mitigate climate change has profound implications for the mining and energy membership of the CFMEU and is the reason why the CFMEU has sought to play a significant role in Australian climate policy dating back to before the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 that saw the adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

### **The key starting point – the science**

The CFMEU accepts the global consensus on climate science as presented by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The CFMEU consequently accepts the need to reduce global net greenhouse gas emissions to a level that is commensurate with limiting global warming to no more than 2 degrees Celsius and preferably less. This requires net anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions to reach zero or below.

Beyond that starting point there is considerable debate about the path that each nation should follow as part of contributing to the global mitigation effort. Debates about, *inter alia*, the required pace of emissions reductions, equitable burden sharing among nations, the

appropriate technologies, and the mix of market mechanisms and regulatory instruments that should be used.

### **The other starting point – guiding principles**

Given that it is broadly accepted that addressing climate change will require large effort, with a very large role for public policy instruments causing major industry restructuring, and with consequences for economic growth, incomes and living standards, the principles that underpin public policy are of critical importance.

Alongside accepting the science-based need to act, it is the principles informing public policy intervention that will determine whether there is broad public support.

The CFMEU supports the principles adopted by The Australian Climate Roundtable in 2015.<sup>1</sup> In the context of this submission we draw particular attention to the statement on equity:

#### “Equity

Reducing Australia’s emissions and adapting to unavoidable climate impacts, some of which are already here, involves both costs and opportunities. New opportunities for decent work should be open to all in the community. The costs of climate policy should be spread fairly within the Australian community and policy should:

- protect the most vulnerable individuals;
- avoid disproportionate impacts on vulnerable people, low income households and the organisations that support them; and
- *assist the successful transition of communities that are especially vulnerable to economic shocks or physical risks as a result of climate change or climate policy.*

Equity should be explicitly addressed in the policy design process, including immediate impacts and those on future generations of Australians.”  
(emphasis added)

The attention of the CCA is also drawn to the outcomes of the 21<sup>st</sup> Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC – COP21 that touch on the same issue – transition:

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.australianclimateroundtable.org.au>

“The Parties to this agreement:

.....

*Taking into account the imperatives of a just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs in accordance with nationally defined development priorities,”*

(Preamble to The Paris Agreement, COP21 outcome, December 2015)

*The CFMEU notes that the CCA has proposed equity as one of four principles for assessing policy. However, while the CCA makes reference to low-income households as one group that should not bear a disproportionate burden of climate policy, there is no reference to the regional and sectoral impact of climate policy measures. The CCA does refer extensively to international competitiveness issues with regard to emission-intensive industries, but that does not capture the potential social impacts of emissions reduction policies on domestic industries.*

### **The adequacy of the CCA’s proposed targets**

The CFMEU does not consider itself as having particular expertise in the determination of appropriate climate targets for Australia and will not spend time here advocating targets or timeframes. (Though we note that a similar lack of expertise among many other parties does not lessen their willingness to push targets!)

It is clear that tougher targets and more rapid time frames require more rapid economic and social restructuring – change that is implemented over 40 years is going to be less difficult than change imposed over just 10 years. The CFMEU, with its primary responsibility to look after the interests of its members and their families, is therefore always going to be cautious about the need for more rapid and stronger action, even if interpretations of the science warrant that pace.

In that context, the CFMEU notes that the CCA’s proposed targets and timeframes released in July 2015 *precede* rather than *follow* its discussion of policy options to achieve them. While acknowledging there is a tendency for public policy to develop in this way, and the CCA is complying with the Terms of Reference given to it by the Minister for the Environment, the CFMEU suggests it would be preferable for policy-makers to have a very good idea of *how* they will achieve a goal *before* they adopt that goal.

*For the CFMEU it is “how we get there” that matters as much as the end goal.* There are good and bad ways to achieve the end goal; how we get there determines the sort of country Australia will become as much as the end goal.

The other point that the CFMEU observes about the targets adopted by the CCA (from the comparison charts on page 8 of the July document) is that the CCA is seeking that Australia engage in a measure of “catch up” to the positions occupied by other developed nations. The CCA proposes among the highest level of cuts in total emissions and, when it comes to per capita emission reductions, it is proposing the highest level of cuts of any developed nation.

The absolute reductions in emissions result in higher per capita reduction because the Australian population is growing more rapidly than most developed nations (some of which are at or near the point of population decline).

Two points follow from this:

1. The CCA is proposing relatively rapid or aggressive emissions reduction targets for Australia especially when considered on a per capita basis, and
2. climate policy needs to complement other public policy; that Australia is choosing to have a high population growth policy (for humanitarian and economic growth reasons) will impact on the achievability of climate policy.

### **The policy options**

The CCA canvasses a suite of policy options. Broadly speaking, even where market mechanisms are favoured, all the options involve regulatory actions as markets (eg. For carbon emission permits) are being created where they previously did not exist.

*The CFMEU has for many years favoured an emissions trading scheme with the broadest application possible.* The climate problem is a society and economy-wide problem and emissions reductions (and sink enhancement) are required everywhere. Singling out sectors for a greater contribution means they are likely to face a disproportionate

burden. And measures targeting the electricity generation sector alone are at best a precursor to policies across other sectors as electricity generation only accounts for one third of Australia's emissions.

As part of supporting an ETS (such as that implemented under the Clean Energy Future package of the former Labor Government) the CFMEU sought specific measures for those parts of the coal mining industry that would have been hardest hit – notably mines with high levels of fugitive methane emissions. The goal was to encourage the industry to shift to low-emission extraction over time without imposing harsh and early penalties on certain mines and their workforces.

The CFMEU has also supported carbon pricing via an ETS because we considered a price on carbon to be essential to providing a commercial rationale for the set of technologies that could transform coal use into a low emission technology – carbon capture and storage (CCS).

It is the lack of carbon pricing combined with the rapid fall in the price of renewable energy technologies that has contributed to the lack of meaningful development of CCS. While CCS technologies will remain critical for reducing emission from industrial processes (like the production of iron and steel, and petrochemicals) it appears they will play a small role in power generation.

The CFMEU is aware of many proposals that seek to facilitate a faster rate of emissions reduction in the electricity supply industry through accelerated closure of brown and black coal-fired power stations. These proposals include tightening emission limits, closure by age of power station, and payments for closure (including via a competitive bidding process).

While the CFMEU prefers a broader approach to emissions reduction, it is agreed that these measures can be complementary to that. *However, the key caveat for the CFMEU is that the measures be socially just and equitable. To date, the CFMEU has seen very little in the way of proposals that treat the impact on coal power station workers and their*

*communities as more than an after-thought.* The Jotzo paper represents progress in this area but nowhere near enough.<sup>2</sup>

### **The affordability of social costs**

There has been very little work done on the social costs of emissions reduction pathways. Even in the relatively discrete area of the electricity supply industry. The aforementioned Jotzo paper gives the “illustrative” example of \$150 million for the compensation of workers and nearby community for the closure of one brown coal-fired power station.

The CFMEU views this illustrative example as wrong by an order of magnitude as it does not meet the minimum threshold of ensuring that those workers and the nearby community are not disproportionately affected by the closure. But at least it is an effort to integrate social costs into the policy option.

The technical modelling work done by organisations like ClimateWorks into how Australia can achieve deep carbonisation contain barely a reference to social costs.<sup>3</sup>

Most economic modelling tends to assume away social costs. Generally full employment is assumed and incomes adjust to the flow of activity from one sector to another, or incomes are deemed less flexible and more unemployment results. Labour is generally assumed to move as freely as capital between industries and across regions, even though it is well-known that that is not a practical reality.

The Labor Government White Paper on energy in 2012 stated that up to \$240 billion in domestic energy sector investment would be required by 2030. Much modelling work prefers to place that in the context of overall economic growth through that period and emphasise that

---

<sup>2</sup> F Jotzo and S Mazouz (2015), Brown coal exit: a market mechanism for regulated closure of highly emissions intensive power stations. CCEP Working Paper 10. Australian National University, Canberra

<sup>3</sup> In the major report “Pathways to Deep Decarbonisation by 2050” (September 2014) there is a brief reference at 38: “some support may be required for the transition of current high emissions industries and regions, for example for retraining of workers, phase out provisions, and transitional support for newly established industries.” The work on technical options may be admirable, but the work on social costs is woeful.

reducing emissions from electricity and other sectors will detract little from overall economic growth.

*The point that must be made here is that there are many regions and many hundreds of thousands of people (directly-employed workers, their families and those in related industries and regions) that are likely to be adversely affected by major electricity industry restructuring. There may well be benefits for other industries, workforces and regions but they are very unlikely to be the same.*

*Therefore there must be explicit commitments to programs that will ensure that those likely to be adversely affected are looked after. And that means a great deal more than some retrenchment pay, help writing a CV and possibly a minor bit of retraining and relocation assistance. The CFMEU has experience with Labour Adjustment Programs in the forestry industry over many decades. While there are valuable insights from that, we do not regard what has occurred there as anything like an adequate response.*

*The CFMEU is not able to cost such programs – they need to be developed. It is suggested that many billions of dollars will be required. While that may seem a lot, it will be minor compared to the overall investment required to substantially decarbonise the electricity supply industry.*

### **The affected regions**

While the location of gas-fired power stations is fairly diverse, coal-fired power stations are located in areas with significant coal resources, as the transport costs for coal are significant and can be minimised by co-locating with coal mines. Thus:

- All four major brown coal power stations in Victoria are located in the Latrobe valley east of Melbourne,
- The four black coal power stations of NSW are all located in the Newcastle / Hunter Valley and Lithgow areas
- The eight black coal power stations of Queensland are located to the west of Brisbane (drawing on the Surat coalfield), and near

Gladstone, Rockhampton and Biloela adjacent to the central Qld coalfields.

- The four black coal power stations of Western Australia are located near Collie.
- The two black coal power stations of South Australia are located in Port Augusta drawing coal from Leigh Creek.

In all these areas analysis of employment in power generation, transmission and distribution, and associated coal mining shows that at least 5% of all employment is directly in those industries. More commonly it is 10%, and reaches 20% in place like Lithgow (NSW and Collie (WA). Then there the people employed in associated manufacturing and service industries.

These regions will be hit hard by policies that aim to rapidly curtail coal-fired power generation. The alternative employment options, where they exist at all, tend to be less-skilled, worse paid and more insecure (for example, winery and tourism jobs in the Hunter valley)

*The equity criteria for climate policy that the CCA professes is meaningless unless those policies deal explicitly, proactively and fairly with those workers and those regions.*

### **Coal-fired power stations are already closing or slated for closure**

A number of coal-fired power stations have already been closed, slated for closure, or mothballed:

- Munmorah power station – NSW – 1400MW - closed in 2012
- Wallerawang power station – NSW – 1000MW - closed in 2014
- Redbank power station – NSW – 144MW – closed in 2014
- Tarong power station – Qld – 2800MW – 2 units totaling 700MW idled in 2012; one returned to service in July 2014

- Playford power station – South Australia – 240MW – only operating in summer for some years – closure in early 2016 announced
- Northern power station – South Australia – 546MW – closure in early 2016 announced.

This list does not include the many power stations running at reduced capacity utilisation. These power stations are less economically viable, and are also deteriorating more rapidly due to being run as intermediate rather than base load.

AGL - one of the three major vertically-integrated power utilities – has announced that it will build no new coal-fired capacity that has unabated emissions.<sup>4</sup> Its current fleet of coal-fired power stations are scheduled to be closed as follows:

- Liddell power station – NSW – 2000MW – 2022
- Bayswater power station – NSW – 2640MW - 2035
- Loy Yang A – Victoria - 2210MW - 2048

The major power utilities and various environmental groups have argued that there is significant excess capacity in the market and that more power stations should be closed sooner rather than later. The former chief executive of AGL stated that there is 9000MW of excess capacity – equal to one third of the base load capacity of the NEM - as part of a strategy pressuring governments to pay for power stations to be closed.<sup>5</sup>

## Conclusion

As part of achieving large cuts in emissions, major restructuring of the power generation sector will occur. The CCA, other parties and protagonists need to move beyond a focus on technologies and broad economic impacts to addressing where major adverse impacts will occur.

<sup>4</sup> AGL Greenhouse Gas Policy issued April 2015

<sup>5</sup> <http://reneweconomy.com.au/2013/agl-says-9gw-of-baseload-fossil-fuels-no-longer-needed-35369>

That often isn't easy, but in the case of power generation it is pretty easy to see where the impacts will be large and adverse.

The history of Labour Adjustment Programs in Australia has been mixed at best and generally woeful. LAPs are generally an after-thought that is tacked on at the end. Almost always, the affected workers and communities are left much worse off.

Thus far, this pattern is being repeated in climate policy. That is nowhere near good enough, especially when the policy framework is meant to include equity considerations as a guiding principle.

*The CFMEU recommends that the Climate Change Authority make a far more integrated and deeper commitment to developing targets and the pathways to achieve them that is just and fair for all Australians. If that doesn't extend to large-scale programs for the regions that we know will be hard hit, the policy program will not have met the equity threshold.*

RTI RELEASED

**From:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 11:08 AM  
**To:** Shane Brunker  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G`morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the

recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point. Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M /MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

**From:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:15 PM  
**To:** Shane Brunker  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch regarding the CleanCo Technical Working Group - it will try and meet next Friday, you should get an invite soon.

Regards Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G`morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point. Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M /MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

RTI RELEASE

---

**From:** Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:32 PM  
**To:** Jason Humphreys  
**Subject:** RE: information as discussed

Thanks Jason, I spoke with Krystal earlier, Contrary to public interest - conduct of industrial relations by an agency

Contrary to public interest - conduct of industrial relations by an agency

Regards,

---

**From:** Jason Humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:15 PM  
**To:** Shane Brunker Contrary to public interest - personal information  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch regarding the CleanCo Technical Working Group - it will try and meet next Friday, you should get an invite soon.

Regards Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** [jason.humphreys](mailto:jason.humphreys) Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G`morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point. Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M / MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\* Only an individual or entity who is intended to be a recipient of this e-mail may access or use the information contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments. Opinions contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Queensland Treasury. The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and the subject of copyright. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Queensland Treasury immediately and erase all copies of the e-mail and the attachments. Queensland Treasury uses virus scanning software. However, it is not liable for viruses present in this e-mail or in any attachment.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

RTI RELEASED

**From:** Stuart Traill <stuart@etu.org.au>  
**Sent:** Monday, 28 May 2018 10:33 AM  
**To:** Jason Humphreys; David.shankey  
**Cc:** Jason Young (ETU)  
**Subject:** Cleanco Working Group

Contrary to public interest -  
personal information

Jason, Dave,

Can you make sure Jason Young is invited to all future Cleanco working group meetings please?

Cheers,

**Stuart Traill**  
Supply Industry Optimisation Manager  
Electrical Trades Union  
Queensland  
M. 0488225625  
F. (07) 40513502  
[stuart@etu.org.au](mailto:stuart@etu.org.au)  
[www.etu.org.au](http://www.etu.org.au)



**Join Online**  
<https://etu.org.au/join-the-qld-nt-branch-now/>

Or call  
1800ETUYES



---

**From:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Monday, 28 May 2018 11:03 AM  
**To:** Stuart Traill  
**Cc:** David.shankey Contrary to Public Interest - personal information Jason Young (ETU)  
**Subject:** Re: Cleanco Working Group

Will do. Thanks for coming on Friday- good input. We'll let you know next steps.

Cheers Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 28 May 2018, at 10:32 am, Stuart Traill <[stuart@etu.org.au](mailto:stuart@etu.org.au)> wrote:

Jason, Dave,

Can you make sure Jason Young is invited to all future Cleanco working group meetings please?

Cheers,

**Stuart Traill**  
Supply Industry Optimisation Manager  
Electrical Trades Union  
Queensland  
M. 0488225625  
F. (07) 40513502  
[stuart@etu.org.au](mailto:stuart@etu.org.au)  
[www.etu.org.au](http://www.etu.org.au)

<image001.png>

**Join Online**

<https://etu.org.au/join-the-qld-nt-branch-now/>

Or call

**1800ETUYES**

<image002.jpg>

<image003.jpg>

<image004.png>

---

**From:** Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Monday, 28 May 2018 3:01 PM  
**To:** Jason Humphreys  
**Subject:** RE: information as discussed

G` afternoon Jason, how did the first meeting go ?, just wondering if you had any minutes from the meeting you could send out or we could catch up for a Coffee.

Regards,

---

**From:** Jason Humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:15 PM  
**To:** Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch regarding the CleanCo Technical Working Group - it will try and meet next Friday, you should get an invite soon.

Regards Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** [jason.humphreys](mailto:jason.humphreys) Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G`morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point. Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M / MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\* Only an individual or entity who is intended to be a recipient of this e-mail may access or use the information contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments. Opinions contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Queensland Treasury. The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and the subject of copyright. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Queensland Treasury immediately and erase all copies of the e-mail and the attachments. Queensland Treasury uses virus scanning software. However, it is not liable for viruses present in this e-mail or in any attachment.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

RTI RELEASED

**From:** jason.humphreys Contrary to public interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 31 May 2018 9:40 AM  
**To:** Shane Brunker  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Hi Shane

Sent from my iPhone

On 28 May 2018, at 3:01 pm, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

G` afternoon Jason, how did the first meeting go ?, just wondering if you had any minutes from the meeting you could send out or we could catch up for a Coffee.

Regards,

---

**From:** Jason Humphreys <jason.humphreys@Contrary to public interest - personal information>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:15 PM  
**To:** Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch regarding the CleanCo Technical Working Group - it will try and meet next Friday, you should get an invite soon.

Regards Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** jason.humphreys@Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G` morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point.

Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M /MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\* Only  
an individual or entity who is intended to be a recipient of this e-mail may access or use the information contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments. Opinions contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Queensland Treasury. The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and the subject of copyright. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Queensland Treasury immediately and erase all copies of the e-mail and the attachments. Queensland Treasury uses virus scanning software. However, it is not liable for viruses present in this e-mail or in any attachment.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 31 May 2018 10:02 AM  
**To:** Shane Brunker  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Hi Shane

The meeting went well, I can fill you in.

Contrary to public interest - personal information

Sent from my iPhone

On 28 May 2018, at 3:01 pm, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

G` afternoon Jason, how did the first meeting go ?, just wondering if you had any minutes from the meeting you could send out or we could catch up for a Coffee.

Regards,

---

**From:** Jason Humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:15 PM  
**To:** Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch regarding the CleanCo Technical Working Group - it will try and meet next Friday, you should get an invite soon.

Regards Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G` morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at

night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point.

Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M /MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This them equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the

construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\* Only  
an individual or entity who is intended to be a recipient of this e-mail may access or use the information contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments. Opinions contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Queensland Treasury. The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and the subject of copyright. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Queensland Treasury immediately and erase all copies of the e-mail and the attachments. Queensland Treasury uses virus scanning software. However, it is not liable for viruses present in this e-mail or in any attachment.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 31 May 2018 10:27 AM  
**To:** Shane Brunker  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Hi Shane

The meeting went well, I can fill you in.

Contrary to Public Interest - personal information We can catch up next week for a coffee.  
What day suits you?

Thanks Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 28 May 2018, at 3:01 pm, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

G` afternoon Jason, how did the first meeting go ?, just wondering if you had any minutes from the meeting you could send out or we could catch up for a Coffee.

Regards,

---

**From:** Jason Humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:15 PM  
**To:** Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch regarding the CleanCo Technical Working Group - it will try and meet next Friday, you should get an invite soon.

Regards Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Brunker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Brunker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** jason.humphreys Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G`morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point.

Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M /MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across

the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\* Only  
an individual or entity who is intended to be a recipient of this e-mail may access or use the information contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments. Opinions contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Queensland Treasury. The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and the subject of copyright. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Queensland Treasury immediately and erase all copies of the e-mail and the attachments. Queensland Treasury uses virus scanning software. However, it is not liable for viruses present in this e-mail or in any attachment.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** Shane Brunker [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 31 May 2018 10:46 AM  
**To:** Jason Humphreys  
**Subject:** RE: information as discussed

I hope all is good Jason, I will come back to you with a day for possibly next week, take care M8.

<p>Shane Brunker <b>District Vice-President</b> CFMEU - Mining &amp; Energy Division Old District</p> <p>M: 0419 472 325 E: [Redacted] W: www.cfmeuqld.asn.au</p>	<p><i>Office Location:</i> 10/66 Drayton Street, Dalby QLD 4405 <i>Postal Address:</i> PO Box 280 Dalby QLD 4405</p>	
---	--	--

**Disclaimer:**  
The information contained in the e-mail is intended only for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed and may be confidential or contain legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that any perusal, use, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately advise us by return e-mail and delete the e-mail document without making a copy. The CFMEU have virus-scanning devices on our system but in no way do we represent that this communication (including any files attached) is free from computer viruses or other faults or defects. We will not be held liable to you or to any other person for loss and damage (including direct, consequential or economic loss or damage) however caused and whether by negligence or otherwise which may result directly or indirectly from the receipt or use of this communication or attached files.



**From:** Jason Humphreys [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 31 May 2018 10:27 AM  
**To:** Shane Brunker [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Hi Shane

The meeting went well, I can fill you in.

[Redacted] We can catch up next week for a coffee.

What day suits you?

Thanks Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 28 May 2018, at 3:01 pm, Shane Brunker [Redacted] wrote:

G` afternoon Jason, how did the first meeting go ?, just wondering if you had any minutes from the meeting you could send out or we could catch up for a Coffee.

Regards,

**From:** Jason Humphreys [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 1:15 PM  
**To:** Shane Brunker [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Re: information as discussed

Thanks Shane, Krystal from Treasury will be in touch regarding the CleanCo Technical Working Group - it will try and meet next Friday, you should get an invite soon.

Regards Jason

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 May 2018, at 10:17 am, Shane Bruncker Contrary to Public Interest - personal information wrote:

Try again.

---

**From:** Shane Bruncker  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 May 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** [jason.humphreys](#) Contrary to Public Interest - personal information  
**Subject:** information as discussed

G`morning Jason, please see below an email from 1 of our senior Operators in the Industry.

In addition I have attached our National Policy and I comments to our recent Board of Management meeting in Queensland.

Thanks for the catch this week.

Firstly the 50% renewable target is not realistic. Whilst you can build solar and wind generation to achieve the target on paper what do we expect is going to happen at night when the solar is no longer providing generation. One might suggest that the wind generation will still be available. Well it may, but what if it is not due to little to no wind or as we have recently seen in SA where there is too much wind. Wind generation does not operate until the air speed is approximately 6m/s (22kmh)

During the summer months it is still very warm into the evening with demand still quite high up to and including the 11pm spike where off peak tariff hot water systems all cut in. So you will have high demand, no solar and potentially little wind generation.

So how can we maintain generation and what are the issues with renewable energy and other generation?

Supply the generation from coal fired power stations. This would only be possible if we continue to build coal fired stations to replace the current ageing fleet we have in Australia. New coal fired power stations will be significantly cleaner than the current fleet of coal fired generators.

We could start gas fired peak load units that would have to be open cycle (35% efficiency compared with 55 to 60% efficiency of a combined cycle GT or a coal fired unit). These units provide generation in a very short period of time at a cost of between \$60 and \$100 / MWH compared to \$20 / MWH for coal.

We could rely on power through the National Grid Interconnectors. So in QLD we could take power from NSW. The NSW interconnector can only take 1000 MW from QLD to NSW and only 500 MW from NSW to QLD. This will not be sufficient to manage the frequency and voltage control within the National Grid. Remember the interconnector only transmits electricity, it still has to be generated by something?

Some will say we will upgrade the interconnector system to supply more power to different areas. This will help but it is not the answer. This was the solution that the SA government suggested after the recent state blackout. SA currently has 40% renewable energy being the highest in Australia. SA has the most expensive power in Australia and the most unreliable as seen recently. Firstly upgrading the interconnector would not have helped in the recent event as the transmission towers were lying on the ground. The answer is to have competitive based load generation online near the Node (term for close to the load centre, close to the city and any large industrial loads). As seen in SA it was not possible to start the base load power station they had offline as they did not have sufficient power to start it. They could not get power to it due the interconnector being down. This brings me to my next point.

Each state must have a reliable tested black start capability. They will all say they have this capability but this was proven to be not true in SA. Gas turbines that can start without grid supply are required. Then the GT's can supply sufficient generation to start large base load units. Wind generation, solar and faulty interconnectors will not help during these events.

Renewables have been proven to be unreliable and expensive (SA has the most expensive electricity in Australia). Renewables are not fully proven. At Kogan Ck Power Station in Qld it was decided to build a 44MW Solar Boost system to supplement the existing 750MW coal fired unit. The 750MW unit was built in 2007 at a cost of \$1.2B. (\$1.6M / MW). The Solar Boost project was approved at a cost of \$200M (\$4.5M /MW). The 44 MW's is peak and would be realised for a maximum 6 to 8 hrs a day in perfect sunshine. As this would only ever be in sunlight hours, will take time to place into service and remove from service it would operate for a max 10 to 12 hrs a day. This then equates to a real power generation output of less than 20 MW's averaged across the 24 hour period. And this is with ideal conditions during summer. So now the real cost to build the solar boost is more like \$10M / MW, some 650% more than the coal fired unit. To make matters worse the technology is unproven and due to this and the construction company meeting financial difficulties towards the end of the project it has been decided to not complete the final stages of construction and the project has been scrapped. Already the \$200M budgeted has been exceeded and the project is not to proceed.

The answer is coal fired power generation. Super and Ultra supercritical design fitted with clean coal technology. In 2015 Callide A Power Station in QLD completed a demonstration of Oxyfuel Combustion and Carbon Capture Storage. This included 10,200 hours of Oxyfuel firing and 5600 hours of carbon capture in an industrial environment. This technology has the potential to reduce CO2 emissions from coal fired power stations by up to 90%.

Renewable energy is expensive and will not be financed by private investors for that very reason. Private investors will only support renewable energy if they are forced to by an impost placed upon them or if the government provide financial support to companies to purchase or construct renewable energy generation. Both of the options above will be funded by the consumers. In the case of an impost for any generator / retailer who does not have renewables in their portfolio, this will result in higher electricity prices (as seen in SA) for which the consumer will foot the bill. The second option of the government providing financial support to companies is tax payers money, so either way we will pay more for renewable energy.

Renewable energy does have a future as peak load generation in the years ahead, however at this point in time it is not cost effective and as some of the electrical generation, transmission, distribution and retail market has now been privatised it would not viable for these companies to invest in renewable energy. One solution to this issue is for the government to buy back the electrical assets that have been sold

previously. This would allow the government to impose any restrictions on types and quantity of generation and allow the exploration of renewable technologies without the impact of the big companies who currently want to have their say in how the pieces of the puzzle will be arranged.

It is very obvious that the answer is clean coal technology. Carbon capture, oxy firing with supercritical high efficiency boilers are the future. To provide a stable national grid we need large based load generation and that is what coal fired generation provides being highly efficient and cost effective.

<SB position on transition.pdf>

<Construction, Forestry, Mining & Energy Union.pdf>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\* Only  
an individual or entity who is intended to be a recipient of this e-mail may access or use the information contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments. Opinions contained in this e-mail or any of its attachments do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Queensland Treasury. The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and the subject of copyright. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Queensland Treasury immediately and erase all copies of the e-mail and the attachments. Queensland Treasury uses virus scanning software. However, it is not liable for viruses present in this e-mail or in any attachment.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

RTI RELEASED