

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Dominic Mobbs [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 2 July 2015 12:27 PM  
**To:** biofuels  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Proposed Ethanol mandate

Project Manager – Queensland biofuel mandate

Dear Sir/Madame

How interesting...on 1 July 2015 as I read the Cairns Post article on "Smart tips to cut car costs" (pg 17) I noted the suggestion that we should "use at least a 95-octane fuel".

A few pages later on page 33 we read about this proposal for an ethanol mandate being welcomed by growers who will financially gain from this proposal...how surprising!

So I have now read the "Towards a clean energy economy: achieving a biofuel mandate for Queensland June 2015 Discussion Paper." (Discussion Paper).

Where does this Discussion Paper acknowledge that fuel containing ethanol results in a higher consumption rate than normal unleaded so you need more of it?

So you may reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 3% to 5% per litre but you use more of it!

How does this mandatory ethanol then result in a "net reduction in greenhouse gases", one of the principle objectives of this whole 'nanny state' exercise?

**It is appalling that Government would unilaterally impose this mandate on consumers.**

**If drivers wish to use fuel containing ethanol for their own vehicle then fine. But why should it be imposed on those who do not wish it?**

The Discussion Paper refers to "Maintaining consumer choice" on page 10 but what is written in this section is totally confusing....

"If the mandate is set at 2%, it is anticipated that choice of fuel will be maintained". This does not make sense. What does this mean? If something is mandated or made compulsory how does choice still exist?

In practice how can imposing 2% ethanol "on the total volume of unleaded sales" work if every litre does not contain ethanol?

Similarly the statement "This will ensure there is a choice of unblended fuels- regular unleaded or premium unleaded- for servicing vehicles that are incompatible with ethanol blends".

How is a 'mandate'... which is the thrust of the whole Discussion Paper... consistent with these above statements?

This whole section is unintelligible bureaucratic gobblegook clearly designed to confuse the general public and pretend their potential concerns are being acknowledged.

And then today we read in the media about the impact of sugar cane farms and their chemical leakage into waterways impacting the Great Barrier Reef (GBR)...and how this is going to have to be curtailed to prevent the GBR being listed as "endangered".

So it appears the solution to this problem is to increase sugar cane production for the production of ethanol!...Hello, is this not just a little inconsistent?

This is Government at its worst...pandering to a noisy minority.

If the public wanted ethanol then they would use the available E10 but as the Discussion Paper acknowledges "E10 use has been declining in recent years...due partly to "consumer choice".

So how does the Government respond...force it on us to appease the independent parliamentary members and stay in power?

Where was the ALP mandate for this policy? Was it part of their platform at the last election? I don't think so.

**No to mandatory ethanol!**

Yours sincerely

Dominic Mobbs

(Non-rent seeking member of the public with no vested financial interest.)