

Dear AEMO

A renewable energy future that we can be proud of and benefits our country starts with planning. Looking at the scenarios proposed we are missing the dispatchable point. Renewables are not created equal and should be preferred accordingly.

The proven track record of dispatchable hydro shows they deserve their own scenario. Base load dispatchable renewables removes a large amount of impacts that we are seeing with proposed intermittent wind and expensive connection.

Pumped hydro is just storage with 20% losses and completely different from dispatchable generating renewables. This also relies on privately owned 'surplus' power that has no locked in price and is therefore not guaranteed to be 'cheap'

A scenario with increasing small scale hydro should be looked at as the backbone of a successful renewable future.

Increasing capacity of renewables is of course an important goal however there are different scales of renewables and intermittent wind should be the last preferred. A energy future to support foreign owned intermittent wind will not be successful mainly due to scale, impacts and ownership.

I also question ruling out dispatchable renewable geothermal using the excuse of distance which is completely incorrect as show by CSIRO and ARENA documents. Citing cost is misleading as dispatchable renewables are always worth more in terms of reliability and efficiency. Cost is only a issue if there are no corporate foreign owned interests lobbying to build it? If that is the only metric then clearly ARENA are only looking at scenarios that benefit the private sector over energy users?

Also connection and storage generates nothing. The Marinus Madness and Battery of Tasmania (nation) will see almost 10 billion dollars in cost and not one watt generated. To deliberately plan to see Tasmania left at the mercy of foreign owned wind is a insult to the builders of our hydro.

Tasmanians deserve better.

Cheers
Lesley Crowden