

Narrabri Gas Project - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Submission Response - Gomeroi Traditional Custodians- Elders and community RAPs

20 May 2017

gomerotraditionalcustodians@hotmail.com

The following review of the Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment associated with the proposed Santos Narrabri Gas Project ('the Project') highlights inadequacies, understatement and over-representation of findings.

We attach to this submission an independent review of the cultural heritage assessment and management plan by archaeologist Peter Kuskie, which mirrors our concerns and finds serious problems with the EIS which must be addressed.

We have to admit to being pretty gobsmacked that the ACHAR and ACHMP have been included in its current form as it has not addressed the concerns and complaint we have held over adequacy and EIS assessment compliance standards raised by us throughout the consultation and "assessment" process.

Of grave concern is that the State Government's requirements detailed as part of the Assessment have not been followed nor can they be demonstrated. We refer to all the documentation and strongly request that these are reviewed in conjunction to our submission.

While the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report is relatively thorough in addressing the guidelines and requirements relating to archaeological assessment, it is not at all thorough or adequate when considering cultural values of Aboriginal peoples and the required integration of these findings to inform the assessment and its recommendations. It has failed miserably to meet standards of consultation and Aboriginal view despite the government policy stating that Aboriginal people determine the cultural value of a place or objects.

These numerous inadequacies are brought to the Department's attention and we strongly request that they be given serious warrant consideration.

These were identified during the consultation phase and assessment of the Project and include but are not limited to:

- inadequacy of consultation
- failure to provide detailed and relevant information to inform a meaningful assessment
- survey inadequacy and failure of survey methodology in accordance with accepted standards
- inadequate survey coverage and social assessment of pedestrian tracks
- questionable methodology and assumptions driving predictive modelling and impact avoidance
- absence of ethnobotanical mapping and consideration importance of place and the passages walkways between places and objects important to Aboriginal people especially the Gomeroi
- Impact of water and our spiritual and cultural traditions including women's business associated with water.
- cumulative impacts and intergenerational equity considerations

The Narrabri gasfield (if approved) is stated to result in direct ground surface impacts to an area totalling approximately 950 hectares (9.5 square kilometres) and representing an estimated 1% of the overall Project area of 95,000 hectares.

In this area, direct and irreversible impacts will occur to Aboriginal cultural heritage (including material evidence or 'objects' and intangible cultural values, including those associated with landscape features, flora and fauna) if this project is approved. We note that the assessment of Project impacts on Aboriginal heritage is specifically required in the context of an EIS.

We note that despite our Elders and people requesting to be taken out on site to undertake appropriate cultural values and ethnobotanical mapping, we were not afforded the opportunity to participate in this assessment as detailed in the EIS assessment requirements set out by the department.

Mapping

The proponent has attempted to address some of these issues through statements that they will undertake 'cultural sensitivity mapping' and develop protocols incorporated in the CHMP to investigate and manage these impact areas once detailed design is finalised, with an emphasis on the avoidance of impacts to Aboriginal heritage.

We hold grave concerns that it appears to be a table the ACHA and an approval will take care of the rest! This approach is inconsistent with archaeological practices and State significant considerations as defined by the EIS assessment requirements.

The review by Kuskie which we attach also finds that this mapping is fundamentally flawed because it relies on very limited data and has failed to include important elements like geology, gradient and vegetation.

It is of concern that an assessment as defined under the EIS requirements may be considered adequate without specific cultural values details to inform the assessment. It should not be a case of "manage once the horse has bolted" and irreversible damage has been made to Aboriginal cultural heritage objects and places of importance.

Such an approach, in the context of impact areas that are not defined at the time of EIS preparation, when it does not include nor incorporates quality baseline data, robust modelling, detailed management strategies and adequate rigour, should be deemed to not represent a suitable strategy for an EIS and heritage management post-approval.

The approach to have a 'claytons' predictive modelling and 'cultural sensitivity mapping' post approval is fundamentally flawed and cannot be supported by the Gomeri Traditional Custodians and our Elders.

Because they are based on the flawed mapping, Kuskie also points out that a number of the proposed management strategies are also inadequate.

To approve of such an approach runs a high risk that it will result in highly adverse culturally irreversible damage and destruction of sacred and cultural places and objects. These are completely unsupported by our people.

Inadequacy of consultation

While we recognise there has been some attempt made by the proponent to provide some form of limited consultation, it is of concern that this has been in isolation and in non-engagement of our Elders in consultation to inform the assessment. We note that a detailed consultation log is absent and reflects the fact that we have not been adequately consulted to inform this assessment. It is of concern that our detailed rejection of the draft ACHAR findings have not been referenced nor can we find anywhere where they have been addressed.

We note that Kuskie also points out that failure to include this log means the assessment **has not been** conducted in accordance with the procedures of the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* policy.

We assert that we have **not been** adequately consulted about the impact areas **nor** have we been consulted to inform the mitigation strategies suggested in the documentation. Therefore the consultation approach must be deemed to be inadequate and not meet standards of practice required by OEH policy and State significant assessment processes.

In the interests of transparent and proper assessment standards details of any of our original correspondences would be made available and details of how each of our concerns have been addressed should be transparently documented and considered. It is noted that Aboriginal people determine the cultural value of a place or object.

As Kuskie also identifies and echoes our concerns, Santos only commits to "working with all RAPs until Project determination, and following determination until the CHMP is finalised". This response (and the CHMP) indicates that Santos does not propose ongoing consultation or provision of information to RAPs once the Project is approved.

This is highly inappropriate and does not reflect the rights and interest of RAPs with cultural values and connections to the area. We find this also a continuum of inadequacy given that RAPs have identified connection and interest in the project area under lore and custom and connection yet are denied any effective means to influence or advise of impact or appropriate mitigation and protocols to address these concerns.

The proposal of a small cultural heritage working group is perceived strongly to be a ploy to avoid continued consultation and participation by RAPs who have strong connections to the area. We have found the consultation process to completely marginalise the voice of our Elders and this appears to be a continued and preferred approach of Santos moving forward.

As Gomeroi Traditional Custodians we requested detailed mapping of waterways and ethnobotanical resources as part of the assessment. These have not been forthcoming and we note have not informed the assessment as detailed as a requirement of the EIS and have not been included in the assessment documentation submitted for review.

This inadequacy is reflective of the overall inadequacy of the assessment and the failure of the consultants and Proponent to adequately consult RAPs in accordance with their EIS assessment requirements.

Failure of predictive modelling

When reviewing the chapter on predictive modelling and its premise as a model to manage and mitigate impacts we struggle to make a more informed assessment as It is impossible to provide predictive modelling feedback with this level of inadequacy in the assessment and mitigation

predictive modelling of impacts. On this basis alone the assessment should be deemed to be inadequate and redone. This is exacerbated by an extremely small survey size area.

It is heartening that Kuskie's review also identifies, the consultants admit that the attributes of the zoning produced by the modelling "should not be viewed as being an accurate reflection of the probably or even possible cultural landscape of either the Data Audit or Project Area."

While it is noted that Kuskie found that the ACHAR (Section 4.3) review of previous archaeological research in the locality may be considered relatively comprehensive from a records perspective we draw to your attention that it should be noted that the area largely has not been assessed for both archaeological and cultural values. The references of where the information was found has not been adequately referenced to inform us further.

Inadequacy of archaeological assessment

As continually stated during the assessment the cultural heritage zone scheme appears to be some half baked methodology based on the notion of understanding surface archaeological evidence not based on an informed knowledge of the cultural landscape and its uses and significance over time for Aboriginal people especially the Gomeroi.

This complete absence of understanding reflects the failure of the assessment to adequately consult or to take the steps to understand the cultural values or archaeological predictive landforms and spatial information based of attempts to understand the occupation and use of the area.

Our concerns are also identified by Kuskie's expert review, the cultural heritage assessment report launches into a "Cultural Heritage Zone Scheme" for a vast area with no development of a model of Aboriginal occupation and use of the landscape, inadequate consideration of the environment of the Project area and inadequate definition of the expected nature and distribution of Aboriginal heritage evidence.

- We the Gomeroi Traditional Custodians and RAP members can't even on the basis of the information provided, have any rhyme or reason of the selection of Zones and the information and cultural values of RAPs to inform such modelling and zone planning.
- There is no model of our people's occupation and the sacredness of the area nor the use of the area including our taboo areas. The assessment does not capture the variant use and changing use of the area over time by our people due to the absence of consultation and response and collaborative assessment and mitigation predictive management modelling.(despite our requests for this to occur)
- There no consideration of the relevant environmental cultural and ethnobotanic variables (such as proximity to and nature of water source, landform, vegetation and geology and songline).
- We cannot even see the standards of land form assessment one would expect by professional archaeologists of which much has been written and is a standard of practice to inform assessments and landform consideration. Without undertaking such care the sensitive areas are meaningless.

Given the significant risks associated with Aboriginal cultural value impacts to the area and the requirements as detailed to the proponent by the Department when undertaking an assessment for a Significant project, this lack of detail and inadequacy should be an area of concern and considered grossly inadequate to inform the department of the assessment and impacts to the area.

Inadequacy of survey

Kuskie in his review is also very critical of the verification survey. This criticism is a mirror of the continued and ongoing concerns that we have raised to the proponent throughout their assessment process. The survey area was too small and without any consideration of landform type and Aboriginal occupation and the survey spacing of the small field crew who walked the transects detailed in the report too wide.

The lack of rigor given the potential impacts of an approved project of this nature is highly concerning. The information detailed in the ACHAR does not meet requirements to be able to adequately inform avoidance and precautionary methodologies.

Kuskie's review disputes the conclusion of the cultural heritage assessment that, "these studies confirmed that a comprehensive process that directly involved representatives of the local Aboriginal community, with systematic survey of the areas in question, and that saw the application both of the Avoidance and Precautionary Principles as standard management tools was feasible in the context of this Project."

We strongly assert in the strongest terms possible that the Precautionary Principle has not been applied. Many of the impact areas themselves are not presently known. And we have not been adequately consulted to inform the precautionary principle or avoidance principle.

Concerns ACHMP

An Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan seems to be provided to cover off or mask the inadequacy of the assessment as some sort of formulaic answer to the inadequacy and unsupported statements made in the ACHAR.

The "methodology and logistics for the Pre-Clearance survey of the work area" in section 4.8 b of the CHMP is total inadequate, run by Santos employees and involving no one with any qualifications in the area, with Santos as the arbitrator of any disagreement.

As Traditional Owners and Elders we find this insulting and completely unacceptable in terms of the methodology for a heritage survey.

Conclusion

We assert in the strongest terms possible that we cannot support this assessment as meeting adequacy therefore the EIS fails to inform the State government of its adverse impacts nor provides any relevant meaningful and rigorous approaches based on science or culture to address impacts. approach and when considering the ACHMP in the context of an inadequate ACHAR to inform it, we are deeply concerned that there will be significant loss and irreversible damage to our cultural heritage and values.

Our role is also pivotal yet we appear to be significantly marginalised or in many instances completely absent from the decision making ongoing and current.

We ask the Department of Planning to ensure that Santos responds in full to the gaps and failures in the assessment consultation and management plan identified by us and further detailed in Kuskie's expert independent review.


The EIS in its current form should not be approved and further studies in alignment with normative standards of cultural protocol consultation and archaeological assessment must be conducted before an assessment of the EIS may be reviewed for consideration by Government.

Further assessment is urgently required to address gaps flaws and poor assessment approaches and urgent steps are required for government to intervene to ensure in keeping with their standards and policies make consultation with Aboriginal people central to its work to inform the assessment.

The complete absence of our cultural values and the meaning of the area is largely due to the refusal of the proponent to adequately consult despite our requests for this to occur and for information to be provided to us to inform the assessment. We have been in effect removed from any assessment mitigation and predictive modelling and the information provided so sparse that an informed assessment is not possible under the approach and inadequate methodology prescribed by the assessment team.

We believe it is on this basis alone the EIS should be deemed inadequate and the project not approved.

Yours faithfully



Veronica (Dolly) Talbott on behalf of the Gomeri Traditional Custodians

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-------|------------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| Reg Talbott | Elder | Betty Condran | Elder | Pam Thomas | Elder |
| James Thomas | Elder | Cyril Sampson | Elder | Rhonda Talbott | Elder |
| Louise Conlan | Elder | Neville Sampson | Elder | Allan Tighe | Elder |
| Joe Conlan | Elder | Joyce Dorrington | Elder | Rona Slater | Elder |
| Delma Jones | Elder | Lal Schumacker | Elder | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Carol and Greg Walsh
 Michael Wright
 Dylan Talbott
 Michael Talbott
 Linda Whitten
 Jason Whitten
 Tleiha Whitten
 Julie Talbott
 Hazel Collins
 Allen Talbott snr
 Allen Talbott Jrn
 Nathan Leslie

Anthony Bennett
 Raymond Weatherall
 Matilda Brady
 Mathew Talbott
 Adam Budden
 Natasha Talbott
 Peter Whitten
 Leonard Talbott
 Kathy King
 Deslee Matthews
 Jeanette Crozier

Mark Walsh
 Daniel Berwick
 Steve Talbott
 Amanda Heard
 Giran Talbott
 Rianna Walsh
 Kylie Walsh
 Kayla Whitten
 Rebecca Collins
 Tracey Matthews
 Dave McGuire
 Paul Spearim

Stephen O'Connor

Chair, Independent Planning Panel.

10th August 2020.

Dear Chair,

I recently participated in the public hearing for the Narrabri Gas Project. In addition to speaking at the hearing, I include below the key points raised at a recent Gomeroi nation meeting that I hosted on zoom on 20th July 2020 and petition details.

By way of background, my name is Maria (Polly) Cutmore. My family are Cubby's and Cutmore's. I was born in Moree; some people say they are locals, I am the original local.

I am a Native Title applicant for the Gomeroi Nation. I was elected in 2016. This is a privilege and honour to me; I come here with the love and respect of my people.

At the Gomeroi national people meeting, with more than 600 Gomeroi people present, the clear intention and position was that we were opposed to mining on our country. The Gomeroi nation has a populations of about 15-20,000 people; our land in north western NSW extends over the Queensland border, to the south as far as Singleton the ranges and to the west where the rivers meet.

Since being elected, I have been at the table as we, as Native Title representatives, have met with Santos. Key concerns that I raised, and other Gomeroi Native Title group raised, has been

- 1) the environmental impact on the Pilliga forest and the ancient water and;
- 2) consultation with my people
- 3) a lack of consideration for our health, wellbeing, heritage and future as Gomeroi people

Flawed consultation

In meetings with us Gomeroi representative, I asked Santos about the level of consultation with my people. They assured me that they had consulted. However, their consultation has been very flawed. This is because it has been with the former membership of the Gomeroi Native Title applicant group that was replaced in 2016. Further, consultation has been limited to just two Local Aboriginal Land Councils (LALCs) and Narrabri Aboriginal community. This consultation does not adequately reflect the level of concern amongst Gomeroi people about the impact of the mine on our country.

I am very concerned that the decision on behalf of Gomeroi people and our country is too serious to be left to one small representative group, two LALCs and the Narrabri Aboriginal community.

My concerns are supported by a submission made on 20 April 2017, undersigned by 15 Gomeroi elders and 30 Gomeroi people, represented by Dolly Talbott. This group of Gomeroi traditional owners voiced their concerns that Santos was limiting its consultation to a select group of Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs). They state that their elders had been excluded from the consultation process and that their requests for ecological and cultural heritage information were ignored by Santos. This Gomeroi group made multiple requests for 'detailed mapping of waterways and ethnobotanical resources', which should have been provided in an Environmental Impact Statement. They wanted to be involved in onsite surveys to identify cultural heritage related to their families.

Santos have said they have consulted with Gomeri people, including the applicant group and in relation to the cultural walks. However, I believe this is a false claim. I have taken the initiative to ask Gomeri people their views about Santos CSG mining in the Pilliga. I have traveled widely over Gomeri country including to the Queensland border and south west towns. These have included Baradine, Coonabarabran, Coonamble, Wee Waa, Pilliga, Walgett, Collarenebri, Mungindi, Toomelah, Boggabillah, Ashford, Inverell Tingha, Delungra, Tamworth, Caroon, Willow Tree, Muswellbrook, Quirindi and Moree. I have also consulted with Gomeri living off-country. I have spoken with many organisations, including the Aboriginal Medical services, Local Aboriginal Land Councils, elders groups and youth groups. **As I have travelled, not one Gomeri Murri or organization supports gas mining or any mining that jeopardises the Pilliga forest and water.**

Every Gomeri person and organization I have spoken to have said this project should not go ahead: that 20 years and any potential compensation is nothing compared with the many thousands of generations and value of the artesian water and important access to our land. We cannot risk our country and our stories, songlines, bloodlines and more recent Aboriginal history with this important area of our country. We have always realized the cultural value of our country and the Pilliga Forest in particular; scientists and the rest of the world are now discovering the value of this place.

I have also created and shared a petition signed by 15,710 supporters which you will find here: <https://www.change.org/p/stop-santos-s-destructive-coal-seam-gas-project-in-pilliga>. I believe that general public supports Gomeri people's rights and interests in the Pilliga Forest and will help us defend our land.

Environmental impact

Our country has felt the impact of extensive land use from the early decades of colonial invasion. We lost many thousands of our people and most of our land within decades of the arrival of the white man. Our country felt the immediate impact of colonization this has included massacres, and extractive industry ranging from timber harvesting of Cyprus, farming, sheep and cattle and from the 1960s, cotton.

The Pilliga Forest is well known for its important habitats and rare animals. The Pilliga mouse, barking owl, black-striped Wallaby, pygmy possum along with caves, rock art, sacred sites. The Forest country has suffered from the drought.

The Pilliga Forest's sandy soil we see as an important filter of water that has supported our people for thousands of generations and now in towns.

The recent drought has really impacted our country.

The clearing of the land has been extensive over Gomeri grasslands country. The Forest is a vital habitat, including for koalas.

There is also significant ongoing Aboriginal heritage in the Pilliga, including working history on the timber mills and farming. One section of the Pilliga is named in honour of an Aboriginal serviceman, Mr Ruttley, and the many Aboriginal graves have been cared for over many generations. Baradine Local Aboriginal Land Council celebrate their community connections and family history of working and living in the Pilliga Forest with a wall of photos, have worked hard to initiate local enterprise through tourism with their 'Sculptures in the Scrub'. Baradine LALC worked hard to negotiate the return of the scar tree from the vaults of a museum that had been removed from the edge of the

Forest in the late 1800s. That tree is now on display in the Baradine LALC. These are examples of the determined interest across Gomerioi nation to protect and preserve the history and connection of this important place.

Santos do not comprehend Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

I do not believe that Santos has an adequate understanding of Gomerioi heritage and its importance to our people. In Santos' Aboriginal heritage report, they state that 90 significant cultural values have been identified and there are likely to be many more cultural values identified.

If they do not have a complete understanding of the heritage onsite, it will be impossible to effectively carry out the management strategy detailed in their heritage plan, which is based on the 'avoidance principle', wherein the construction of project infrastructure will completely avoid identified culturally significant object and the 'precautionary principle', which will seek to minimise harm to known Aboriginal objects by creating a strategy on a case by case basis.

Water is our part of our cultural heritage

Santos must acknowledge that the water that will be extract for the Gas Project is of immense cultural significance to Gomerioi people. It is the source of life in the Pilliga forest, necessary for our plants, food, medicine, and animals. It is connected to lore and part of our songs, dances, dreaming stories and art. Our carved trees - so called 'Aboriginal objects' - are still alive and requires water for survival. Magpie Geese, which have only just started breeding again in North West Narrabri are dependent on flows from the Pilliga. Our heritage is alive and it depends on a bountiful and clean water source. Santos must therefore acknowledge that the risk of heritage destruction goes beyond 'construction and exploration stage' of their project; Aboriginal cultural heritage will be impacted by any attempt to extract water from the Great Artesian Basin.

Water for nations

Gomerioi water scientist Brad Moggridge has voiced his concern. He explains that the Santos Gas Project may have greater repercussions than what is stated in Santos's project proposal. The extraction of water from the Great Artesian Basin put the Murray Darling Basin at even greater risk, affecting not only the livelihood of Gomerioi people but also many Aboriginal nations across South-Eastern NSW. Without input from the Great Artesian Basin, rivers within the Murray Darling Basin may stop flowing.

Steven Booby, Gomerioi culture and heritage expert, has argued water is important for our health, wellbeing and sense of self. Gomerioi people and other Aboriginal nations feel immense sorrow and grief in periods of drought and over extraction and conversely, we see tremendous improvements to health and wellbeing when our community has access to water. There are no social programs or environmental offsets that Santos can fund, which will be able to replace the vitality we feel when our sacred water is clean and protected.

Aboriginal peoples' rights to water have not been adequately recognised: less than 1% of water in NSW has been returned to Aboriginal people; we are not given rights to determine how our water is used; and we are consistently excluded from decisions relating to our water. The approval of the Santos Gas Project will repeat this sorry legacy - limiting us further in our use and access to water.

Gomerioi have no land! Under the NSW Aboriginal Land Rights Act we have not been able to recover land. We have no land. Being able to defend the Pilliga is critical because

Alternate economies

Research Director at the Institute of Sustainable Futures based at the University of Technology Sydney, Dr Sven Teske, and his colleagues Tom Morris and Kriti Nagrath, conducted an analysis of the potential for renewable energy in the Narrabri region and we attach this work in the appendix.

Dr Teske's research finds that Santos' coal seam gas is not a long-term economical option. In 2019, his team found that 70.1% of all global investment into power plants went to renewables; 12% into gas; 10% into gas and less than 4% into nuclear. The reason for this investment is that solar and wind farms are cheap and can be built quickly. On a global level, 75% of all new energy generation projects are renewable energy. These figures illustrate that economic support for gas projects is diminishing.

Dr Teske and colleagues conducted a regional study of energy generation in Narrabri shire. Coinciding with a global trend, his team found that in Narrabri, power generation through fossil fuels was more expensive than power generation through solar and wind. The researchers also found that Narrabri Shire has good wind and solar resources, and will be a viable location for a renewable energy farm. Energy generation will last more than 20 years and based on grid location, Narrabri can potentially be a key energy supplier for the state.

Based on our concerns, we agree with Dr Teske that a community-owned windfarm will be the most viable plan for the energy generation in the Narrabri region. It is a development that does not require any water. It is labor intensive providing long-term operational and maintenance jobs. Dr Teske and his colleagues found that a solar/gas farm would create at minimum on average, about 300 jobs per year for the next 10 years. And at maximum, up to 3500 mid-term jobs for construction and installation; 1500 jobs for long-term and operation and maintenance.

Furthermore, wind turbines are typically locally owned and run. With careful thought, there are ways to ensure that the profits are dispersed in the community. Aboriginal traditional owners and Local Aboriginal Land Councils and Shire Councils can receive a fraction of the profits from energy generation. A windfarm requires less land than Santos's proposed gas mine, to generate the same amount of energy. We are optimistic about the potential of a community-owned wind farm. For example, we see opportunities for a national training centre for renewable energy to be opened in the region delivering training opportunities to Traditional Owners, who can learn about operation, maintenance and will have access to secure jobs on Gomeri country.

We believe that the Government can contribute to economic development in the region by developing infrastructure, such as stronger powerlines which will enable the transportation of electricity from Narrabri to Sydney.

Sustainable and innovative development must be seriously considered as an alternative to Santos CSG Mine. The NSW government has an unparalleled opportunity to simultaneously meet the state's energy needs, support regional development and meet the Australian Governments' outstanding commitment to 'close the gap' between First Nations and non-Indigenous Australians.

We urge you to reject the Narrabri Gas Project over our Gomeri country. The Narrabri Gas Project comprises our water, our country, our future!


Polly Cutmore
Gomeri Native Title Applicant.

References

Teske, S., Morris, T., Nagrath, K., (2017) RENEWABLE NARRABRI: Solar and Wind versus Gas in North-West New South Wales. Report prepared by ISF for Lock the Gate, January 2018.

Talbott, D. on behalf of Gomeri Traditional Custodians. 'Narrabri Gas Project', 20 May, 2017.

Cutmore, P. 'Yanaay Santos Yanaay! Stop Santos's destructive coal seam gas project in Pilliga', public petition: <https://www.change.org/p/stop-santos-s-destructive-coal-seam-gas-project-in-pilliga>.




RENEWABLE NARRABRI SHIRE:
Solar and Wind versus Gas
In North-West New South Wales



**Institute for
Sustainable
Futures**

2018



ABOUT THE AUTHORS

The Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) was established by the University of Technology Sydney in 1996 to work with industry, government and the community to develop sustainable futures through research and consultancy. Our mission is to create change toward sustainable futures that protect and enhance the environment, human well-being and social equity. We seek to adopt an inter-disciplinary approach to our work and engage our partner organisations in a collaborative process that emphasises strategic decision-making.

For further information visit: www.isf.uts.edu.au

Research team: Dr Sven Teske, Tom Morris, Kriti Nagrath

COOPERATION PARTNER

The report has been commissioned by Lock the Gate and all information related to the Narrabri Gas Project has been taken from public websites. ISF did not undertake any direct interviews with company representatives from Santos. The contract focus for ISF was the development of RENEWABLE energy scenarios.

CITATION

Teske, S., Morris, T., Nagrath, K., (2017) RENEWABLE NARRABRI: Solar and Wind versus Gas in North-West New South Wales. Report prepared by ISF for Lock the Gate, January 2018.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge data and advice contributed by December 2017.

All conclusions and any errors that remain are the authors own.

DISCLAIMER

The authors have used all due care and skill to ensure the material is accurate as at the date of this report. UTS and the authors do not accept any responsibility for any loss that may arise by anyone relying upon its contents.

INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURES

University of Technology Sydney

PO Box 123

Broadway NSW 2007

AUSTRALIA

www.isf.edu.au

© UTS January 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK..... | 5 |
| Executive Summary..... | 6 |
| 1 Narrabri Shire: regional information and Scenario assumptions..... | 9 |
| 1.1 Narrabri Shire overview..... | 9 |
| 1.2 Narrabri SHIRE: Economic situation and workforce..... | 9 |
| 1.3 Power demand..... | 12 |
| 1.3.1 Cost projections for investment, operation and maintenance costs..... | 12 |
| 2 Narrabri SHIRE Mapping | 14 |
| 2.1 Mapping Methodology – Process & Assumptions..... | 14 |
| 2.2 Electricity infrastructure in nsw | 15 |
| 2.3 Wind energy potential in NSW and the Narrabri Shire | 16 |
| 2.4 Solar energy potential in NSW and the Narrabri SHIRE..... | 18 |
| 3 Methodology Employment | 20 |
| 3.1 Employment Factors | 22 |
| 4 The Narrabri Shire: Renewable Export scenario..... | 23 |
| 4.1 Assumptions for the RENEWABLES export scenario | 23 |
| 4.2 Electricity Generation Capacity development..... | 24 |
| 4.3 Electricity Generation for NSW and the Narrabri Shire | 25 |
| 4.4 RE-ADV-X: Electricity Export for the Narrabri Shire..... | 26 |
| 4.5 RE-X: Electricity Export for the Narrabri Shire | 27 |
| 4.6 Investment requirements..... | 28 |
| 4.7 Employment effects..... | 29 |
| 4.8 Comparing Narrabri Renewable export cases to Narrabri Gas Project | 30 |
| 5 Regional energy context | 31 |
| 5.1 Power plants in NSW | 31 |
| 5.1.1 New Energy Projects in NSW | 31 |
| 5.2 The proposed narrabri gas project..... | 31 |
| 5.2.1 Santos estimation: GAS PRODUCTION..... | 32 |
| 5.2.2 Santos estimation: Economic and employment | 33 |
| Appendix | 34 |

FIGURES

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1: Narrabri Shire – Industry Shares | 9 |
| Figure 2: Electricity infrastructure in New South Wales..... | 15 |
| Figure 3: Population Density and electricity infrastructure in New South Wales..... | 16 |
| Figure 4: Wind potential in New South Wales and the Narrabri Shire | 17 |
| Figure 5: Solar potential in New South Wales and the Narrabri Shire | 18 |
| Figure 6: Potential renewable wind and solar energy sites in Narrabri Shire, comparing land area with the proposed Narrabri Gas Project. . | 19 |
| Figure 7: Comparison of land area required for the different scenarios..... | 19 |
| Figure 8: Methodology overview..... | 21 |
| Figure 9: Installed capacity development for Australia for the Advanced Renewables scenario until 2030..... | 24 |
| Figure 10: Assumed installed capacities under the RE-ADV-X and RE-X case for the Narrabri Shire until 2030 | 24 |
| Figure 11: RE-ADV-X: Average annual power generation in NSW and the Narrabri Shire 2015 – 2030 | 25 |
| Figure 12: RE-ADV-X - Possible generation and electricity export curve 2020 | 27 |
| Figure 13: RE-ADV-X - Possible generation and electricity export curve 2030 | 27 |
| Figure 14: RE-X - Possible generation and electricity export curve 2020..... | 28 |
| Figure 15: RE-X -Possible generation and electricity export curve 2030..... | 28 |
| Figure 16: Proposed new power plants for the NEM area (May 2017)..... | 31 |
| Figure 17: Installed Capacities of NSW power generation 2017 | 31 |
| Figure 18: Map of the Narrabri Gas Project..... | 32 |
| Figure 19: Domestic gas consumption in Eastern Australia | 33 |

TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: RE-X: Narrabri Shire electricity production and export to NSW 2020 and 2030..... | 7 |
| Table 2: Key results – Narrabri Shire RENEWABLES Export (RE-X) | 7 |
| Table 3: Employment by Industry | 10 |
| Table 4: Data sources for GIS mapping Narrabri Shire..... | 14 |
| Table 5: Summary of employment factors for power generation technologies | 22 |
| Table 6: RE-ADV-X: Average annual power generation in NSW and the Narrabri Shire 2015 – 2030..... | 25 |
| Table 7: RE-X: Average annual power generation in NSW and the Narrabri Shire 2015 – 2030..... | 26 |
| Table 8: RE-ADV-X: Narrabri Shire electricity production and export to NSW 2020 and 2030 | 26 |
| Table 9: RE-X: Narrabri electricity production and export to NSW 2020 and 2030..... | 27 |
| Table 10: Key results – Narrabri Shire:..... | 28 |
| Table 11: Key results – Narrabri Shire:..... | 28 |
| Table 12: Employment effects– Narrabri RENEWABLES ADVANCED Export (RE-ADV-X) | 29 |
| Table 13: Employment effects– Narrabri RENEWABLES Export (RE-X) | 29 |
| Table 14: Specific investment costs for power generation | 34 |
| Table 15: Operation and maintenance costs for power generation technologies | 35 |
| Table 16: New South Wales power plants..... | 36 |

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK

Research structure

This research is divided in four parts:

1. Mapping of solar and wind resources for the Narrabri Shire
2. Development of a pathway for new installed capacity of solar and wind power generation in the Narrabri region for 2020 and 2030
3. Calculation of possible generation output from new capacities of renewable energy (RE) as an alternation to gas exports from the Narrabri Shire to New South Wales
4. Compare RE parameters with planned gas developments (based on publicly available Santos information)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Shire must however balance any negative impacts from renewable energy development against the continued need to sustain its agricultural base. The NSW Government has committed to utilise energy production from renewable sources (wind, solar, biofuel, geothermal) to 20% of all production by 2020. Narrabri Shire's part of the "New England Renewable Energy Precinct" established by the State Government in February 2010 to attract investment in renewable energy prospects".¹

Narrabri Shire Economic Social Plan 2000-2015

In September 2013, the NSW Government released the NSW Renewable Energy Action Plan to guide NSW's renewable energy development and to support the former national target of 20% renewable energy by 2020. According to this plan, the NSW Government's vision for a secure, reliable, affordable and clean energy future is estimated to create 6,000 new jobs in regional NSW. The strategy is to work closely with NSW communities and the renewable energy industry to increase renewable energy generation in NSW². This action plan is in line with the RENEWABLE exports scenario(s) outlined in this report.

This report has been commissioned by Lock the Gate in order to analyse solar and wind resources for the Narrabri Shire and to develop pathways for solar and wind power generation in the Narrabri Shire for 2020 and 2030. The Narrabri Shire covers an area of around 13,000 square kilometres. It is located in the heart of the Namoi Valley in the North West slopes and plains of New South Wales. Based on the potential electricity generation from new renewable energy (RE) power plants, ISF developed two different renewable export scenarios to provide an alternative to gas exports from the Narrabri Shire to New South Wales.

In both Renewable Energy Export scenarios, the Narrabri Shire plays an important part in New South Wales' energy transformation – producing significantly more electricity than is required locally, resulting in more and longer lasting jobs for the Shire than the Narrabri gas field would generate, and affecting a much smaller area of land. The scenarios outlined in this report are aligned with the NSW Renewable Energy Action Plan.

In the **RENEWABLE ADVANCE EXPORT (RE-ADV-X)** scenario, significant land area in the Narrabri Shire is dedicated to solar and wind generation. Though with 38 km² of solar photovoltaic and 120 km² of wind power, the total land area needed to fulfil this ambitious scenario is only 17% of the area proposed to be occupied by the Santos gas field. This scenario would lead to a capacity of 3,800 MW of solar photovoltaic and 600 MW of wind installed by 2030 turning Narrabri Shire into an energy powerhouse.

While the Narrabri Shire currently has an average load of 9 MW – with a peak just under 20 MW - the RE-ADV-X would deliver a maximum solar and wind production of 1,450 MW in 2020 and up to 3,900 MW in 2030. This scenario requires addition power lines as well as a significant enforcement of the existing 132 kV transmission line in order to export this capacity to the Australian National Electricity Market (NEM) grid³. The actual required grid concept is not within the scope of this analysis

A second, more conservative scenario – the **RENEWABLE EXPORT (RE-X)** scenario – will require a total land area of 41 km² in the Narrabri Shire; 6 km² for solar photovoltaic and 35 km² of wind power. The total land area needed to fulfil this scenario is only 4% of the area proposed to be occupied by Narrabri Gas Project. Under the RE-X 622 MW of solar photovoltaic and 175 MW of wind would be installed in the Shire by 2030 and supply at all times 100% of Narrabri Shire's power demand and export the remaining power to the NEM grid. Table 1 shows the average projected demand, supply and export quantities for 2020 and 2030 under the RE-X scenario. The maximum export capacity will be limited to 240 MW in 2020 and 640 MW by 2030, however the average

¹ Narrabri Shire Economic Social Plan, 2000-2015 (N-ESP 2015), [http://www.narrabri.nsw.gov.au/files/uploaded/file/Economic%20Development/Narrabri%20Shire%20Economic%20Social%20Plan_Public%20Exhibition%20Final\(1\).pdf](http://www.narrabri.nsw.gov.au/files/uploaded/file/Economic%20Development/Narrabri%20Shire%20Economic%20Social%20Plan_Public%20Exhibition%20Final(1).pdf)

² NSW Renewable Energy Action Plan; <https://www.resourcesandenergy.nsw.gov.au/energy-consumers/sustainable-energy/renewable-energy-action-plan>

³ Australian Energy and Market Operator (AEMO): The National Electricity Market (NEM) incorporates around 40,000 km of transmission lines and cables; supplies about 200 terawatt hours of electricity to businesses and households each year and serves around 9 million customers. It has a total electricity generating capacity of almost 54,421 MW (as at December 2017). <https://www.aemo.com.au/Electricity/National-Electricity-Market-NEM>

export capacity in 2030 is around 154 MW. The existing power line might still need an upgrade, however the required additional power transmission capacity is significantly lower than that for the advanced case.

Table 1: RE-X: Narrabri Shire electricity production and export to NSW 2020 and 2030

| | Total [MWh/a] | Load | |
|---|------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | MAX [MW] | AVERAGE [MW] |
| Electricity Production Narrabri Shire 2020 | 548,840 | 240 | 63 |
| Demand Narrabri Shire 2020 | 74,511 | 17 | 9 |
| Export Narrabri Shire to NSW 2020 | 474,330 | 231 | 54 |
| Electricity Production Narrabri Shire 2030 | 1,432,332 | 641 | 164 |
| Demand Narrabri Shire 2030 | 81,962 | 19 | 9 |
| Export Narrabri Shire to NSW 2030 | 1,350,370 | 632 | 154 |

In order to install the suggested solar and wind capacity for the ADVANCED case (RE-ADV-X), a total investment of approximately \$6.5 billion is required. The amount can be lower, if solar photovoltaic and wind turbine equipment and installation costs continue to fall as they have over the past decade due to economies of scale. The RE-X case requires less than one sixth of the overall investment volume - \$ 1 billion - compared to the advanced case. The majority of the investment will be in solar photovoltaic, while the investments for wind are moderate and in the typical range of a community lead project.

Table 2: Key results – Narrabri Shire RENEWABLES Export (RE-X)

| Narrabri Shire: RENEWABLES EXPORT - Key Results - | | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
| | 2015 [MW] | 2020 [MW] | 2025 [MW] | 2030 [MW] |
| Installed Capacity | 50 | 298 | 550 | 797 |
| - Wind (Onshore) | 0 | 72 | 104 | 175 |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | 50 | 226 | 446 | 622 |
| Total Investment Cost 2015 - 2030 | 2015-2020 | | 2021-2030 | |
| - Wind (Onshore) | \$ 43 mio. | | \$ 55 mio | |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | \$ 303 mio. | | \$ 602 mio. | |

Employment effects

The RE-ADV-X would create at the peak of the construction period up to 3,600 jobs. Government policy to support apprenticeships and skills development would significantly impact the proportion of jobs that could be taken up by Narrabri Shire residents, compared to those taken by the existing labour force of the wider Australian solar and wind industry.

Unlike construction and installation jobs, the operation and maintenance jobs will have to be done by the local workforce, as they need to be close to the power plants. A specific training and education program is required to build up a skilled workforce to operate and maintain solar photovoltaic and wind power plants in the Narrabri Shire. By 2030, around 2,500 solar and 180 wind workers will be required in the Narrabri Shire. Thus, in comparison with the existing workforce of around 6,000 people in the region, the solar and wind industry can become as important as the current largest employer in the Narrabri Shire - the agriculture sector.

The RE-X still leads up to 500 jobs during the peak construction time and – in addition – between 200 to 500 jobs in operation and maintenance in 2020 - 2030 respectively. This translates to around 430 solar and 50 wind workers in the Narrabri Shire by 2030.

Conclusion: COMPARING NARRABRI RENEWABLE EXPORT CASES TO NARRABRI GAS PROJECT

According to Narrabri Gas Project information, the 950 km² production field is projected to produce gas with an energy content of around 74 PJ per year or approximately 8 TWh/a electricity (assumptions see 5.2.1). If this entire area were used for solar photovoltaics, the output would be just over 100 TWh/a – higher than the expected output of the gas field – for as long as solar power plants would operate in that region, while the gas field will only provide energy for a limited period of time.

The RENEWABLES scenarios in this analysis however have adopted a much more conservative approach and estimated potential based on current and projected future demand in the Narrabri Shire. Under the RE-ADV-X case, 2.98 TWh will be exported, while the RE-X case would lead to an export of 0.474 TWh annually. Thus, income from exported electricity from Narrabri Shire to the rest of NSW will benefit the community as long as the power plants are in operation, while the gas field will be exhausted after a limited period. Furthermore, employees who operate and maintain solar and wind power plants as well as the regional power grid will have sustainable long-term jobs.

The RE-ADV-X case would require an investment of \$ 6.5 billion for the power generation capacity, double the planned investment for the gas field, but would create at least 15 times more employees for operation and maintenance on around 17% of the area the gas field would take up.

The RE-X case requires one third of the planned gas field investment, but would create around 3 times more long-term jobs in operation and maintenance than the Narrabri Shire Gas Project. Furthermore, it would only require 41 km² i.e. 4% of the proposed gas field area.

The authors suggest developing a detailed regional project development plan and supporting policies in order to encourage apprenticeships and skills development in the solar and wind technologies for the Narrabri Shire.

1 NARRABRI SHIRE: REGIONAL INFORMATION AND SCENARIO ASSUMPTIONS

1.1 NARRABRI SHIRE OVERVIEW

The Narrabri Shire covers an area of around 13,000 square kilometres. It is located in the heart of the Namoi Valley in the North West slopes and plains of New South Wales. Set against the backdrop of the Nandewar Ranges and on the banks of the Namoi River, the town of Narrabri is the administrative centre of the Shire⁴. Narrabri is a transport hub on the crossroads of the Newell and Kamilaroi Highways, and operates freight services to major cities and ports by rail, road and air. An existing inland port supports local distribution, transportation and logistics industries. The climate is mild with average summer temperatures between 20-39 °C, while the winter temperatures range from 0-20 °C; the average annual rainfall is approximately 657 mm per year.


1.2 NARRABRI SHIRE: ECONOMIC SITUATION AND WORKFORCE

The Narrabri Shire has a stable population of around 13,000 persons⁵ with minor growth rates. However, the annual population growth in the Narrabri Shire was higher than the average for the New England and North West region (0.6%) and slightly lower than the level for New South Wales (1.1%). The most recent ABS Australian Business Register indicated there were an estimated 1,463 local businesses (i.e. registered for GST and actively trading) in Narrabri Shire in June 2011⁶, which represented an annual increase of 0.1%⁷. Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing is the largest industry in terms of business numbers in Narrabri Shire, accounting for 44.0% of the total number of businesses, followed by the Construction (10.4%), Transport, Postal & Warehousing (6.9%) and Rental, Hiring & Real Estate Services (6.5%) sectors. As of January 2018, there is no more recent information about the Narrabri industry situation available.

Figure 1: Narrabri Shire – Industry Shares

Businesses by Industry

Narrabri Shire, June 2011



Source: ABS 8165.0

⁴ <http://www.narrabri.nsw.gov.au/introduction-to-narrabri-shire-1167.html>

⁵ In 2016, the Narrabri Shire had 13,084 persons

⁶ The Narrabri Shire did not undertake any further employment inventory survey after 2011.

⁷ Narrabri Economic Profile; http://www.narrabri.nsw.gov.au/files/uploaded/file/Economic%20Development/Narrabri_Shire_Economic_Profile.pdf

EMPLOYMENT IN THE NARRABRI SHIRE

There were 6,013 people who reported being in the labour force in the week before the 2016 Census night in Narrabri. Of these 60.6% were employed full time, 27.4% were employed part-time and 6.0% or 359 people were unemployed⁸. There is a decline in employment numbers from the previous recorded number of 7,463 people in 2012. The overall population also shows a small decline over this period. However the unemployment rate in Narrabri Shire was 5.2% in the December Quarter 2012. Unemployment in Narrabri Shire has remained below 6% or around 450 people since the December Quarter 2004⁷.

Table 3 shows the employment by industry in the Narrabri Shire and – for comparison – in New South Wales. Agriculture is the single largest employment provider with around 20% of the total population engaged with the sector, followed by retail & trade and healthcare & social assistance with close to 10% each. The remaining 60% of the Shire's working population is distributed across 17 other sectors and therefore diversified, which is an economic strength of this region. In 2016, the mining sector employed 266 persons, or 4.8% of Narrabri Shire's work force⁸, a slight increase since 2011.

Table 3: Employment by Industry

| Industry | Narrabri Shire | | New South Wales | |
|--|----------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
| | Total 2011 | % of total | Total 2011 | % of total |
| Agriculture, forestry & fishing | 1,248 | 20.7 | 69,014 | 2.2 |
| Mining | 257 | 4.3 | 30,809 | 1.0 |
| Manufacturing | 296 | 4.9 | 264,406 | 8.4 |
| Electricity, gas, water and waste services | 71 | 1.2 | 34,159 | 1.1 |
| Construction | 403 | 6.7 | 228,893 | 7.3 |
| Wholesale Trade | 220 | 3.6 | 138,300 | 4.4 |
| Retail Trade | 572 | 9.5 | 324,314 | 10.4 |
| Accommodation & food services | 360 | 6.0 | 210,185 | 6.7 |
| Transport, postal & warehousing | 373 | 6.2 | 154,449 | 4.9 |
| Information media & telecommunications | 33 | 0.5 | 72,320 | 2.3 |
| Financial & insurance services | 81 | 1.3 | 158,175 | 5.1 |
| Rental, hiring & real estate services | 53 | 0.9 | 51,511 | 1.6 |
| Professional scientific & technical services | 287 | 4.8 | 246,198 | 7.9 |
| Administrative & support services | 123 | 2.0 | 102,121 | 3.3 |
| Public administration & safety | 276 | 4.6 | 192,426 | 6.1 |
| Education & training | 367 | 6.1 | 248,635 | 7.9 |
| Health care & social assistance | 565 | 9.4 | 363,406 | 11.6 |
| Arts & recreation services | 37 | 0.6 | 46,299 | 1.5 |
| Other services | 247 | 4.1 | 117,499 | 3.8 |
| Not stated | 169 | 2.8 | 77,100 | 2.5 |
| Total | 6,038 | 100.0 | 3,130,219 | 100.0 |

Source: Narrabri Economic Profile, ABS 2011 Census

⁸ 2016 Census, Australian Bureau of Statistics http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/quickstat/LGA15750

Future Perspectives

The Narrabri Shire Economic Social Plan, 2000-2015 (N-ESP 2015), published in 2010, states that there is 'potential for a growing green economy' and highlights the following sectors:

- Building Retrofitting
- Mass Transit/Freight Rail
- Smart Grid
- Wind Power
- Solar Power
- Advanced Biofuels

Furthermore, the N-ESP 2015 states that "collectively, these six industries could be generating \$US243 billion in investment for Australia and employing 847,000 workers by 2030⁹. In a similar vein, CSIRO has calculated that 560,000 new jobs will be created in high environmental impact industries (like manufacturing and heavy industry) by 2025 if Australia sets course to become carbon neutral by 2050. With respect to individual sectors, the job potential is:

- Renewable energy: up to 500,000
- Energy efficiency: 75,000
- Sustainable water systems: 75,000
- Biomaterials: 33,000
- Green buildings: 230,000
- Waste and recycling: 50,000 (14,000 direct 36,000 indirect)

The Shire must however balance any possible impacts from renewable energy development against the continued need to sustain its agricultural base. The NSW Government has committed to 20% of all production energy production to be from renewable sources (wind, solar, biofuel, geothermal) by 2020. Further, Narrabri Shire is part of the "New England Renewable Energy Precinct" established by the State Government in February 2010 to attract investment in renewable energy prospects".¹⁰

In September 2013, the NSW Government released the NSW Renewable Energy Action Plan to guide NSW's renewable energy development and to support the former national target of 20% renewable energy by 2020. According to this plan, the NSW Government's vision for a secure, reliable, affordable and clean energy future is estimated to create 6,000 new jobs in regional NSW. The strategy is to work closely with NSW communities and the renewable energy industry to increase renewable energy generation in NSW¹¹. This action plan is in line with the RENEWABLE exports scenario(s) outlined in this report.

Alongside the sector growth in renewables for energy production, the Narrabri Shire is host to an application for the biggest coal seam gas production field in NSW, the Narrabri Gas Project.

⁹ Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) and Australian Conservation Foundation (ACTU), Green Gold Rush – How ambitious environmental policy can make Australia a leader in the global race for green jobs, 2008

¹⁰ Narrabri Shire Economic Social Plan, 2000-2015 (N-ESP 2015),

[http://www.narrabri.nsw.gov.au/files/uploaded/file/Economic%20Development/Narrabri%20Shire%20Economic%20Social%20Plan_Public%20Exhibition%20Final\(1\).pdf](http://www.narrabri.nsw.gov.au/files/uploaded/file/Economic%20Development/Narrabri%20Shire%20Economic%20Social%20Plan_Public%20Exhibition%20Final(1).pdf)

¹¹ NSW Renewable Energy Action Plan; <https://www.resourcesandenergy.nsw.gov.au/energy-consumers/sustainable-energy/renewable-energy-action-plan>

1.3 POWER DEMAND

The load curves in megawatt per hour used for this work for New South Wales and the Narrabri Shire are taken from the Australian Renewable Energy Mapping Infrastructure (AREMI) website. AREMI is a spatial data platform for the Australian energy industry and aims to support developers, financiers, and policy makers in evaluating spatial renewable energy information. AREMI is funded by the Australian Renewable Energy Agency and developed by Data61 in partnership with Geoscience Australia and the Clean Energy Council¹². By the end of 2015, 1,904 small scale solar photovoltaic roof-top system have been installed in the Narrabri Shire¹³.

The annual electricity demand projections for 2020 and 2030 are calculated with an annual increase of 1%. This assumption is based on a 100% renewable energy scenario for Australia that was developed by the University of Technology Sydney, Institute for Sustainable Futures (UTS/ISF) in 2016¹⁴. This scenario assumes an increased deployment of electric vehicles, while consumer and industrial electricity consumption decreases due to energy efficiency measures.

1.3.1 COST PROJECTIONS FOR INVESTMENT, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Assumptions for the specific investment and operation costs of coal, gas, brown coal and oil power plants have been made according to the World Energy Outlook (WEO) *2014 Special Report on Investments*¹⁵. Because these resources are at an advanced stage in terms of both technology and market development, the potential for cost reduction is limited. On the other hand, different renewable energy technologies have different costs, levels of technical maturity and development potential. While hydropower has been widely used for decades, other technologies – such as the gasification of biomass or concentrated solar power plants – have yet to reach market maturity. Thus, some renewable technologies being employed today are at a relatively early stage in market development, while others have already developed mature markets. It is expected, however, that for renewable technologies, large cost reductions will come from technical advances, manufacturing improvements and large-scale production, unlike conventional technologies. The dynamic trend of cost developments over time plays a crucial role in identifying economically sensible expansion strategies for scenarios spanning several decades.

By their very nature, some renewable sources, including wind and solar power, provide a variable supply, requiring a revised coordination with the grid network. However, although in many cases renewable energy technologies are ‘distributed’ – their output being generated and delivered locally to the consumer – they also have large-scale applications like utility scale wind parks, photovoltaic power plants or concentrated solar power stations.

To identify long-term cost developments, learning curves have been applied to the model calculations, to reflect how the cost of a particular technology changes in relation to cumulative production volumes. The learning factor (or progress ratio) sits between 0.75 for less mature systems and 0.95 and higher for well-established technologies. A learning factor of 0.9 means that costs are expected to fall by 10% every time the cumulative output from the technology doubles. Empirical data shows, for example, that the learning factor for PV solar modules has been fairly constant at 0.8 over 30 years, whilst that for wind energy varies from 0.75 in the UK to 0.94 in the German market.

ISF’s research partner, the German Aerospace Centre (DLR) Institute for Technical Thermodynamics, Technology and System-Analysis, has developed cost projections for renewable energy technologies.

Assumptions on future costs for renewable electricity technologies were derived from a review of learning curve studies by Lena Neij¹⁶, the analysis of technology foresight and road mapping studies, including the European

¹² AREMI, <https://nationalmap.gov.au/renewables/#share=s-xbJhVq8tzR2U8Pji>

¹³ Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS): (http://stat.abs.gov.au/itt/r.jsp?RegionSummary®ion=15750&dataset=ABS_REGIONAL_LGA2016&geoconcept=LGA_2016&maplayerid=LGA2016&measure=MEASU_RE&datasetASGS=ABS_REGIONAL_ASGS2016&datasetLGA=ABS_REGIONAL_LGA2016®ionLGA=LGA_2016®ionASGS=ASGS_2016)

¹⁴ Teske, S., Dominish, E., Ison, N. and Maras, K. (2016) 100% Renewable Energy for Australia – Decarbonising Australia’s Energy Sector within one Generation. Report prepared by ISF for GetUp! and Solar Citizens, March 2016.

¹⁵ IEA 2014: *Power Generation in the New Policies and 450 Scenarios - Assumed investment costs, operation and maintenance costs and efficiencies in the IEA World Energy Investment Outlook 2014*, data file download: <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/investment/>

¹⁶ Neij, L. ‘Cost development of future technologies for power generation - a study based on experience curves and complementary bottom-up assessments’, *Energy Policy* 36 (2008), 2200-2211

Commission funded NEEDS project (New Energy Externalities Developments for Sustainability)¹⁷, the IEA Energy Technology Perspectives 2008, projections by the European Renewable Energy Council published in April 2010 (“Re-Thinking 2050”) and discussions with experts from different sectors of the renewable energy industry.

In 2014 and 2015, DLR updated and revised cost projections for the Greenpeace International Energy [R]evolution research¹⁸. Due to significant cost decreases between 2014 and 2016, recent market developments have been taken into account leading to a further reduction in assumed costs, particularly for photovoltaics and solar thermal power plants (including heat storage). However, to increase consistency in the modelling, cost assumptions from WEO 2014 are adopted for biomass power plants, hydro and wind power.

These cost assumptions – especially for the base years – have been adapted to current Australian costs based on the Australian Power Generation Technology Report¹⁹. Future cost projections have been compared with several other projections including the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) Renewable Power Generation Costs in 2014²⁰.

Numerous cost projections, particularly for renewable power generation technologies – have been published in recent years. In August 2017, the US-based National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) published a comprehensive survey – the 2017 Annual Technology Baseline (ATB)²¹. All publications show that renewable power generation continues to reduce costs, though costs vary significantly by region. In this research, a conservative cost reduction rate has been chosen due to the relatively small size of Australia’s current renewable energy market. Even with high growth rates, the market is likely to remain small in comparison to global standards; therefore, the cost reductions assumed in this analysis are conservative and may be larger, further increasing the economic benefits of the RENEWABLES cases.

¹⁷ www.needs-project.org

¹⁸ This research has been undertaken for more than 10 years and resulted in more than 100 country analyses

¹⁹ CO2CRC Limited, 2015, *Australian Power Generation Technology Report*, Australia, www.co2crc.com.au

²⁰ IRENA, *Renewable Power Generation Costs in 2014*, January 2014, Abu Dhabi, www.irena.org

²¹ National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Annual Technology Baseline (ATB) August 2017, <https://www.nrel.gov/news/press/2017/nrel-updates-baseline-cost-and-performance-data-for-electricity-generation-technologies.html>

2 NARRABRI SHIRE MAPPING

2.1 MAPPING METHODOLOGY – PROCESS & ASSUMPTIONS

The Global Information System (GIS) mapping exercise aims to ascertain the renewable energy resources (primarily solar and wind) available in the Narrabri Shire. It also helps to develop an understanding of the existing geographic and demographic profile of the region. Mapping the available electricity infrastructure highlights opportunities that could be leveraged in developing the renewable energy scenarios.

Open source data and maps from various sources were used to visualize the region. Further demographic data related to population as well as infrastructure in terms of centralized transmission network and power plants was also plotted on to the map. Raster images were converted to vector maps to enable analysis using the Conversion tool in QGIS. Geo-processing tools were used to understand the potential of wind and solar resources at the local level.

The wind atlas used in the spatial modelling was generated using the DNV GL Wind Mapping System (WMS). The WMS is a dynamical downscaling system developed to generate high-resolution mesoscale wind maps for any part of the world. For this analysis wind speed at a height of 100 meters was used to determine the electricity generation potential. Similarly, Bureau of Meteorology Australian Hourly Solar Irradiance Gridded Data was used to estimate the solar power generation potential. The average yearly DNI (Direct Normal Insolation/ Irradiation) values in the region range from 900-1050 W/m²/year. The values are usually highest in cloud-free conditions in the middle of the day.

In order to isolate potential sites for wind and solar power generation, it was important to avoid conflict with competing uses of land. Hence, areas of national parks and nature reserves, forestry and environmental management were not included in the analysis. The selected sites are located in areas earmarked as primary production. Areas mapped by the Government as Biophysical Strategic Agricultural Land (BSAL) have been excluded from consideration given their importance for agriculture and any placement of renewable energy generation facilities in other parts of the Shire would have to be assessed for its compatibility with agricultural land uses.

The area of both land available for potential solar and wind power generation was calculated using the *Field Calculator*. This input feeds into the GIS Model as described below.

Table 4: Data sources for GIS mapping Narrabri Shire

| Data | Source |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Land use / Land cover | NSW Department of Planning and Environment, NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure |
| Boundaries | NSW Department of Planning and Environment |
| Population Demographics | National Exposure Information System (NEXIS) |
| Power plants & Transmission lines | Australian Renewable Energy Mapping Infrastructure (AREMI) |
| Solar Irradiance | Bureau of Meteorology |
| Wind Speed | DNV GL |
| Terrain / Topography | Google Satellite / Earth |

2.2 ELECTRICITY INFRASTRUCTURE IN NSW

Figure 2 represents the existing electricity infrastructure in New South Wales. The diamonds show the positions of major power plants; black diamonds represent non-renewable and green diamonds, renewable power generation plants. The red dotted outline at the centre of the map marks the position of the Narrabri Shire relative to the state.

Figure 2: Electricity infrastructure in New South Wales





Figure 3 overlays the population density over the electricity infrastructure. The darker areas signify higher population densities and coincide with where the transmission network is most dense. The onshore oil pipeline is visible in Southern Queensland, just above the NSW/QLD border.

Figure 3: Population Density and electricity infrastructure in New South Wales



Zooming into Narrabri Shire (Figure 4), we can see the existing Wilga Park Gas Power Station (black diamond). The closest green diamond is the Lake Keepit Hydro Power Station.


2.3 WIND ENERGY POTENTIAL IN NSW AND THE NARRABRI SHIRE

Figure 4 shows the wind energy potential of the region. In order to operate wind farms economically, the average annual wind speed should not be below 6 m/s. The map shows the range of wind speeds prevalent in the region with the blue areas at the lower end of 5 – 6 m/s and the yellow areas with 7 – 8 m/s. As seen in the map, the south and a small part of the northeast Narrabri Shire show the best potential for wind generation. However, this area falls under National Parks and Nature Reserves. The potential land area available eliminates conflicting uses and focuses on land available for primary production (excluding the land earmarked by the government as Strategic Agricultural land). Except the southeast corner of the Narrabri Shire, the region has a medium to good wind potential. The overall area with an average annual wind speed of over 6m/s covers 5684 km² which is 43% of the Shire's area.

The maximum wind turbine density is calculated with 5 MW per square kilometre, meaning that 1 large or 2 medium size wind turbines, in either cases with a hub height not under 100m can be installed per square kilometre. The actual space requirement for one turbine is around 25 X 25 m for the fundament of the tower and grid connection equipment; the distance in-between wind turbines should be 6 to 7 times the rotor diameter (of around 100 – 130 m) in order to achieve a good wind farm efficiency. The land in between the turbines of a wind farm can of cause be used as agricultural land as usually done in wind farms of Europe, the Americas and Asia.

With these assumptions, 44% of the Narrabri Shire is suitable to host wind farms which adds up to a technical potential of over 28 GW of installed wind capacity. This is obviously only a mathematical figure, in practice only a fraction of these areas should be opened for wind farm development.

Figure 4: Wind potential in New South Wales and the Narrabri Shire



Comparison with international experiences: Case study North Germany

The federal government of Germany directed all communities to identify 1% to 2% of their land that is suitable of wind farm development between 1997 and 1998. There are over 12,000 communities in Germany and at the end of 2017 - 20 years later - around 28,000 wind turbines have been installed with a total capacity of 46,000 MW. Those wind turbines supply 13% of Germany's total electricity demand and have created a market with over 120,000 jobs.

Germany covers a total area of 357.385 km², compared to the area of NSW with 809.444 km². The northern most state of Germany, Schleswig-Holstein that has a border with Denmark in the north, had a total installed wind capacity of 5,700 MW²² at the end of 2017. This state covers an area of 15.799 km² with a total population of 2.8 million, in comparison; the Narrabri Shire covers 13,434 km² and with a population of 14,000. The average wind speed of Schleswig Holstein is around 5m/s inland and 6m/s to 7.5m/s²³ in coastal regions, thus the wind resource of Narrabri Shire is comparable to Schleswig-Holstein. For this analysis, we assume a possible installed capacity of around 600 MW, which requires 2% of the area suitable for wind farms.


²² <https://www.schleswig-holstein.de/DE/Themen/W/windenergie.html>

²³ <http://www.norddeutscher-klimamonitor.de/klima/1981-2010/jahr/mittlere-windgeschwindigkeit/schleswig-holstein-hamburg/coastdat-2.html>

2.4 SOLAR ENERGY POTENTIAL IN NSW AND THE NARRABRI SHIRE

The solar resource of the Narrabri Shire is quite encouraging. For the solar energy potential assessment, the same land constraints are used as documented in section 2.1. The range of annual solar irradiation in the region is between 900 – 1050 W/m². The technical potential for the suitable land area (Figure 5) would add up to over 173 GW of solar power in the Narrabri Shire. The proposed Narrabri Gas Project covers 950 km² (see 5.2) or 7% of Narrabri’s total land area. An area of approximately 31 km by 31 km, could host a 95,000 MW utility scale solar photovoltaic power plant in case the entire surface would be used. The average annual generation of a solar plant of this size would lead to 105 TWh/a with the Narrabri Shire’s solar resource, enough to supply 75% of NSW electricity demand. Again, this is a theoretical output and only calculated to demonstrate the region’s significant solar potential.

Figure 5: Solar potential in New South Wales and the Narrabri Shire



For the Narrabri Shire under the Advanced Renewable (RE-ADV-X) Scenario, the authors suggest a deployment of a solar farm in an area equal to 4% (38 km²) of the Narrabri Gas Project surface i.e. with an expanse of just 6.2 km by 6.2 km. This solar power plant would generate around 4.5 TWh electricity per year, enough to supply 3% of New South Wales 2016 electricity demand of around 140 TWh. A more conservative scenario (RE-X) requires only an equivalent of 6 km² or 0.6% of the Santos gas field area.

Figure 6 shows the potential area available for wind and solar power plants in the Narrabri Shire and compares the area proposed for the Narrabri Gas Project to the area of land that would be occupied by renewable energy in the two scenarios featured in this report²⁴. The red area shows the potential sites for renewable energy generation within the LGA. Only a fraction of the area of land to be occupied by the proposed gas field would be necessary to generate the renewable energy and ongoing jobs represented by our two scenarios. The green

²⁴ Scenarios described in Section 4

boxes demonstrate to scale the total area of land in the shire needed for solar and wind generation in the two scenarios. These could be located in any suitable part of the Narrabri Shire. Windfarms can be co-located with agricultural production, but solar energy is a more intensive land use. Figure 7 shows a comparison of the land required for each of the scenarios as compared to the proposed Santos gas field.

Figure 6: Potential renewable wind and solar energy sites in Narrabri Shire, comparing land area with the proposed Narrabri Gas Project.





Figure 7: Comparison of land area required for the different scenarios



3 METHODOLOGY EMPLOYMENT

The Institute for Sustainable Futures at the University of Technology Sydney modelled the effects of the employment for the global, regional and national energy sector between 2009 and 2015 for the Energy [R]evolution (E[R]) science project²⁵. The chapter is based on this work and has adopted most parameters and assumptions from the E[R] analysis for the Narrabri Shire analysis. However, the employment factors for the base year have been controlled and updated as required. This section provides a simplified overview of how the calculations were performed. A detailed methodology is also available²⁶. Chapters 2 and 4 contain the data and input parameters used to develop the scenarios.

For the **RENEWABLES** scenario, the main inputs to the calculations are:

- The amount of electrical capacity that will be installed each year for each technology
- The primary energy demand for gas and biomass fuels in the electricity sector
- The amount of electricity generated per year from each source

Employment:

- ‘Employment factors’, or the number of jobs per unit of capacity, were separated into manufacturing, construction, operation and maintenance, and per unit of primary energy for fuel supply.
- For the 2020, 2025, and 2030 calculations, there is a ‘decline factor’ for each technology that reduces the employment factors by a certain percentage per year. This reflects the fact that employment per unit falls as technology efficiencies improve.

Regional factor:

- The percentage of local (Narrabri Shire) manufacturing in relation to domestic (Australian) fuel production, in order to calculate the proportion of manufacturing and fuel production jobs which occur in the Narrabri Shire.
- A “regional job multiplier”, which indicates how labour-intensive economic activity is in Australia compared to other world regions. This is used to adjust Australian employment factors where local data is not available and international factors were used. For Australia, it is assumed that average OECD employment factor will apply.
- The electrical capacity increase and energy use figures from each scenario were multiplied by the employment factors for each of the technologies, and then adjusted for regional labour intensity and the proportion of fuel or manufacturing which occurs locally.

A range of data sources are used for the model inputs, including the International Energy Agency, US Energy Information Administration, BP Statistical Review of World Energy, US National Renewable Energy Laboratory, International Labour Organisation, World Bank, industry associations, national statistics, company reports, academic literature, and ISF’s own research.


These calculations only take into account direct employment, for example the construction team needed to build a new wind farm. They do not cover indirect employment, for example the extra services provided in a town to accommodate the construction team. The calculations do not include jobs in energy efficiency, although these are likely to be substantial.

²⁵ The Energy [R]evolution series has been financed and developed by Greenpeace International between 2004 and 2015 and has been acknowledged as the most accurate renewable energy forecasts worldwide by numerous scientific publications. The E[R] scenario series served as benchmark scenarios for the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) of the United Nations

²⁶ Rutovitz, J., Dominish, E. and Downes, J. 2015. Calculating global energy sector jobs: 2015 methodology update. Prepared for Greenpeace International by the Institute for Sustainable Futures, University of Technology Sydney.

The large number of assumptions required for these calculations mean that employment numbers are indicative only, especially for regions where little data exists. However, within the limits of data availability, the figures presented are representative of employment levels under the two scenarios.

Figure 8: Methodology overview



The authors assumed that manufacturing of wind, solar power plants will most likely not take place in the Narrabri Shire, and therefore, employment effects from manufacturing are not calculated.

3.1 EMPLOYMENT FACTORS

“Employment factors” are used to calculate how many jobs are required per unit of electrical capacity, or per unit of fuel are required. They take into account jobs in manufacturing, construction, operation and maintenance, and fuel. Table 5 lists the employment factors used in the calculations. These factors are usually from OECD countries, as this is where most data is available. For job calculations for the Narrabri Shire, the OECD (= Australia) regional factor has been used.

Table 5: Summary of employment factors for power generation technologies

| | Construction/ installation REGIONAL Job years/ MW | Manufacturing (INTER) NATIONAL Job years/ MW | Operations & maintenance REGIONAL Jobs/MW | Total Jobs years/MW | Fuel – PRIMARY energy demand |
|--------------|--|--|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Coal | 11.2 | 5.4 | 0.14 | 16.74 | <i>OECD Factor</i> |
| Gas | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.14 | 2.34 | <i>OECD Factor</i> |
| Biomass | 14.0 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 18.4 | 29.9 Jobs/PJ |
| Hydro-large | 7.4 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 11.1 | |
| Hydro-small | 15.7 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 27.3 | |
| Wind onshore | 3.2 | 4.7 | 0.3 | 8.2 | |
| Solar PV | 13.0 | 6.7 | 0.7 | 20.4 | |
| Geothermal | 6.8 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 11.1 | |

Note: For details of sources and derivation of factors see Rutovitz et al, 2015²⁷

²⁷ Rutovitz et al, 2015, <https://opus.lib.uts.edu.au/bitstream/10453/43718/1/Rutovitzetal2015Calculatingglobalenergysectorjobsmethodology.pdf>

4 THE NARRABRI SHIRE: RENEWABLE EXPORT SCENARIO

In this section, two different renewable export scenarios are developed. In both Renewable Energy Export scenarios, the Narrabri Shire plays an important part in New South Wales' energy transformation – producing significantly more electricity than is required locally, resulting in more and longer lasting jobs for the Shire than the Narrabri Gas Project would generate, and affecting a much smaller area of land.

In the RENEWABLE ADVANCE EXPORT (RE-ADV-X) scenario, significant land area in Narrabri Shire is dedicated to solar and wind generation, though with 38 km² of solar photovoltaic and 120 km² of wind power, the total land area needed to fulfil this ambitious scenario is only 17% of the area proposed to be occupied by Santos gas field. This scenario would see 3,800 MW of solar photovoltaic and 600 MW of wind installed by 2030 turning Narrabri Shire into an energy powerhouse.

A second more conservative scenario – the RENEWABLE EXPORT (RE-X) scenario – will require significantly less space and would limit the renewable power export to around 200 MW to 250 MW. This which would still require an upgrade of the existing 132 kV power line, but may not require an entirely new high voltage line. However, the required power system analysis was not part of this analysis.

The RE-X case would require a total land area of 41 km² in the Narrabri Shire: 6 km² for solar photovoltaic and 35 km² of wind power. The total land area needed to fulfil this scenario is only 4% of the area proposed to be occupied by Narrabri Gas Project. This scenario would see 622 MW of solar photovoltaic and 175 MW of wind installed in the Shire by 2030 expected to supply at all times 100% of Narrabri Shire's power demand and export the remaining power generation to the NEM power grid.

4.1 ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE RENEWABLES EXPORT SCENARIO

The RENEWABLES EXPORT (RE-X) and the RENEWABLE ADVANCED EXPORT (RE-ADV-X) scenarios are built on a framework of energy policy targets and assumptions that strongly influence the development of solar photovoltaic and wind power and structural support (grid connection, technology support, education) for each technology. The main assumptions considered for both scenario-building processes are as follows:

- Renewable industry growth:** Dynamic growth in new capacities for solar photovoltaic and wind power generation is assumed based on current knowledge about potential, costs and recent trends in renewable energy deployment (see energy potentials discussed in Chapter 2). Communities in New England / Narrabri Shire will play a significant role in the expansion of this renewable capacity, particularly concerning site-specific project development, inclusion of local population and operation of regional and/or community owned renewable power projects.
- Gas project phase-out:** It is assumed that the proposed Narrabri Gas Project will not go ahead. Instead, part of the site that is not excluded for nature conservation will be available for potential utility scale solar photovoltaic and wind projects.
- Future power supply:** The new solar and wind capacity increases are relatively stable over the entire scenario period, while the demand of the Narrabri Shire is assumed almost stable over the entire modelling period. The surplus electricity will be exported to the NSW power grid and used to support supply in NSW and the NEM.

This chapter provides an overview to the results for the calculated RENEWABLE scenarios for Narrabri Shire. The development of power generation capacity for Australia, NSW and the Narrabri Shire are based on the ADVANCED RENEWABLES scenario that has been developed from UTS/ISF published in March 2016.²⁸

²⁸ Teske, S., Dominish, E., Ison, N. and Maras, K. (2016) 100% Renewable Energy for Australia – Decarbonising Australia's Energy Sector within one Generation. Report prepared by ISF for GetUp! and Solar Citizens, March 2016

4.2 ELECTRICITY GENERATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Figure 9 shows the development of total installed power plant capacity for Australia in case a 100% renewable energy pathway will be implemented until 2050. The main technologies in the scenario are solar photovoltaic, onshore wind and concentrated solar power, with dispatchable power plants, like bio energy, hydro and geothermal. In addition, a combination of demand side management and storage technologies such as pumped hydro, batteries and hydrogen/synthetic fuels are included to guarantee year round reliable and secure power supply.

Figure 9: Installed capacity development for Australia for the Advanced Renewables scenario until 2030





Figure 10: Assumed installed capacities under the RE-ADV-X and RE-X case for the Narrabri Shire until 2030



As part of the Narrabri Shire energy export concept, the region will produce significantly more electricity than required locally. Electricity will therefore be the new export product of the Narrabri Shire. Under the RE-ADV-X case, 2.98 TWh will be exported, while the RE-X case would lead to an export of 0.474 TWh annually.


4.3 ELECTRICITY GENERATION FOR NSW AND THE NARRABRI SHIRE

Table 6 and Figure 11 show the average annual power generation for NSW and the Narrabri Shire between 2015 and 2030 for the ADVANCE RENEWABLE EXPORT (RE-ADV-X) case and Table 7 shows the RE-X case with significantly lower solar and wind capacities. While NSW uses a whole range of (renewable) power generation technologies, Narrabri Shire only generates electricity from solar photovoltaic and wind power. The electricity will be exported via (new) power transmission lines to the main NSW power grid that is part of the NEM. The RE-ADV-X would require a significant expansion of the power grid capacity in order to enable to export enough electricity from the Narrabri Shire to the NEM power grid.

Table 6: RE-ADV-X: Average annual power generation in NSW and the Narrabri Shire 2015 – 2030

| Average Power Generation [GWh] | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Region NSW and Narrabri | | | | | |
| Scenario: ADV RENEWABLES / RE-ADV-X | | | | | |
| | 2015 | 2020 | 2020 | 2030 | 2030 |
| | NSW | NSW | Narrabri | NSW | Narrabri |
| Power plants | 92,688 | 70,879 | 3,062 | 63,196 | 7,508 |
| - Hard coal | 45,948 | 47,707 | 0 | 4,198 | 0 |
| - Lignite | 20,617 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Gas | 8,722 | 1,698 | 0 | 7,295 | 0 |
| - Oil/Diesel | 66 | 85 | 0 | 1,369 | 0 |
| - IMPORT | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Nuclear | | | | | |
| - Biomass | 46 | 68 | 0 | 1,486 | 0 |
| - Hydro | 12,750 | 13,948 | 0 | 19,973 | 0 |
| - Wind (Onshore) | 1,637 | 2,016 | 1,095 | 3,860 | 2,096 |
| - Wind (Offshore) | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3,216 | 0 |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | 2,886 | 4,619 | 1,967 | 12,707 | 5,412 |
| - Geothermal | 0 | 502 | 0 | 7,649 | 0 |
| - Solar thermal power plants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,444 | 0 |
| - Ocean energy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Variable RES (PV, Wind, Ocean) | 4,540 | 6,636 | 3,062 | 19,782 | 7,508 |
| Share of variable RES | 5% | 9% | 100% | 31% | 100% |
| RES share (domestic generation) | 19% | 30% | 100% | 80% | 100% |

Figure 11: RE-ADV-X: Average annual power generation in NSW and the Narrabri Shire 2015 – 2030



The RE-X case assumes an ambitious but slower expansion of the solar photovoltaic and wind capacities over the next 15 years as compared to the advanced case. By 2030, 10 to 15 utility scale solar photovoltaic and wind farms will be operating within the Narrabri Shire.

Table 7: RE-X: Average annual power generation in NSW and the Narrabri Shire 2015 – 2030

| Average Power Generation [GWh] | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|--------------|
| Region: NSW and Narrabri | | | | | |
| Scenario: ADV RENEWABLES / RE-X | | | | | |
| | 2015 | 2020 | 2020 | 2030 | 2030 |
| | NSW | NSW | Narrabri | NSW | Narrabri |
| Power plants | 92,688 | 70,879 | 549 | 63,196 | 1,426 |
| - Hard coal | 45,948 | 47,707 | 0 | 4,198 | 0 |
| - Lignite | 20,617 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Gas | 8,722 | 1,698 | 0 | 7,295 | 0 |
| - Oil/Diesel | 66 | 85 | 0 | 1,369 | 0 |
| - IMPORT | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Nuclear | | | | | |
| - Biomass | 46 | 68 | 0 | 1,486 | 0 |
| - Hydro | 12,750 | 13,948 | 0 | 19,973 | 0 |
| - Wind (Onshore) | 1,637 | 2,016 | 245 | 3,860 | 597 |
| - Wind (Offshore) | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3,216 | 0 |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | 2,886 | 4,619 | 304 | 12,707 | 837 |
| - Geothermal | 0 | 502 | 0 | 7,649 | 0 |
| - Solar thermal power plants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,444 | 0 |
| - Ocean energy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Variable RES (PV, Wind, Ocean) | 4,540 | 6,636 | 549 | 19,782 | 1,429 |
| Share of variable RES | 5% | 9% | 100% | 31% | 100% |
| RES share (domestic generation) | 19% | 30% | 100% | 80% | 100% |

4.4 RE-ADV-X: ELECTRICITY EXPORT FOR THE NARRABRI SHIRE

Table 8 shows the average projected demand, supply and export quantities for 2020 and 2030. While the Narrabri Shire only has an average load of 9 MW – with a peak just under 20 MW - the maximum solar and wind production can add up to over 1,450 MW in 2020 and up to 3,900 MW in 2030. This scenario requires addition power lines as well as a significant enforcement of the existing 132 kV transmission line in order to export this capacity to the NEM grid. The actual required grid concept is not within the scope of this analysis.

Table 8: RE-ADV-X: Narrabri Shire electricity production and export to NSW 2020 and 2030

| | Total [MWh/a] | Load | |
|--|---------------|----------|--------------|
| | | MAX [MW] | AVERAGE [MW] |
| Electricity Production Narrabri Shire 2020 | 3,062,469 | 1,451 | 350 |
| Demand Narrabri Shire 2020 | 74,511 | 17 | 9 |
| Export Narrabri Shire to NSW 2020 | 2,987,959 | 1,438 | 341 |
| Electricity Production Narrabri Shire 2030 | 7,511,454 | 3,878 | 857 |
| Demand Narrabri Shire 2030 | 81,962 | 19 | 9 |
| Export Narrabri Shire to NSW 2030 | 7,429,493 | 3,864 | 848 |

Figure 12 and Figure 13 show the projected solar and wind generation for one day in December (2020) and one day in September (2030). Those projections are based on actual wind, solar and demand data of the 19th December respectively the 28th September²⁹ for the Narrabri Shire. This hourly simulation has been done in order to assess the maximum and average export capacity and the possible annual generation for solar and wind power plants in this region. On annual average, the combination of wind and solar photovoltaic electricity supply was more than sufficient to supply the Narrabri Shire with reliable power; the average generation capacity was at 63 MW in the 2020 simulation, while the average load was only at around 9 MW. Storage technologies can increase security of supply further and enable the operator of solar and wind farms to trade electricity to the NEM with more independent from the actual time of generation.

Figure 12: RE-ADV-X - Possible generation and electricity export curve 2020





Figure 13: RE-ADV-X - Possible generation and electricity export curve 2030



4.5 RE-X: ELECTRICITY EXPORT FOR THE NARRABRI SHIRE

Table 9 shows the average projected demand, supply and export quantities for 2020 and 2030 under the RE-X scenario. The maximum export capacity will be limited to 240 MW in 2020 and 640 MW by 2030, however the average export capacity in 2030 is around 154 MW. The existing power line might still need an upgrade, however the required additional power transmission capacity is significantly lower than that for the advanced case.

Table 9: RE-X: Narrabri electricity production and export to NSW 2020 and 2030

| | Total [MWh/a] | Load | |
|--|---------------|----------|--------------|
| | | MAX [MW] | AVERAGE [MW] |
| Electricity Production Narrabri Shire 2020 | 548,840 | 240 | 63 |
| Demand Narrabri Shire 2020 | 74,511 | 17 | 9 |
| Export Narrabri Shire to NSW 2020 | 474,330 | 231 | 54 |
| Electricity Production Narrabri Shire 2030 | 1,432,332 | 641 | 164 |
| Demand Narrabri Shire 2030 | 81,962 | 19 | 9 |
| Export Narrabri Shire to NSW 2030 | 1,350,370 | 632 | 154 |

²⁹ Solar data from 28th September and 19th December 2012, wind data from 28th September and 19th December 2010 and load from 19th December 2016 with an assumed increase of 1% per year until 2020 and 2030 respectively

Figure 14 and Figure 15 show projected solar and wind generation for the same days as shown for the advanced case, the overall export capacities are significantly lower. A storage management might further limit the required grid upgrade. However, the system optimisation required exceeded the scope of this analysis.

Figure 14: RE-X - Possible generation and electricity export curve 2020





Figure 15: RE-X -Possible generation and electricity export curve 2030



4.6 INVESTMENT REQUIREMENTS

In order to install the suggested solar and wind capacity for the advanced case (RE-ADV-X), a total investment of approximately \$6.5 billion is required. The amount can be lower, in case solar photovoltaic and wind turbine equipment and installation costs will continue to fall as they have over the past decade due to economies of scale. Table 10 and Table 11 provide an overview of the key results of the investment calculations. Additional investments in the power grid infrastructure are required in order to transport the generated electricity to the NEM power network, which was not within the scope of this analysis. The RE-X case requires less than one sixth of the overall investment volume - \$ 1 billion – compared to the advanced case. The majority of the investment will go in solar photovoltaic, while the investments for wind are moderate and in the typical range of a community lead project.

Table 10: Key results – Narrabri Shire:

RENEWABLES ADVANCED Export (RE-ADV-X)

| Narrabri Shire: RENEWABLES EXPORT - Key Results - | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 |
|---|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
| | [MW] | [MW] | [MW] | [MW] |
| Installed Capacity | 50 | 1,703 | 3,186 | 4,403 |
| - Wind (Onshore) | 0 | 320 | 461 | 598 |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | 50 | 1383 | 2,725 | 3,805 |
| Total Investment Cost 2015 - 2030 | 2015-2020 | | 2021-2030 | |
| - Wind (Onshore) | \$ 320 mio. | | \$ 251 mio | |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | \$ 2,293 mio. | | \$ 3,681 mio. | |

Table 11: Key results – Narrabri Shire:

RENEWABLES Export (RE-X)

| Narrabri Shire: RENEWABLES EXPORT - Key Results - | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 |
|---|------------------|------------|------------------|------------|
| | [MW] | [MW] | [MW] | [MW] |
| Installed Capacity | 50 | 298 | 550 | 797 |
| - Wind (Onshore) | 0 | 72 | 104 | 175 |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | 50 | 226 | 446 | 622 |
| Total Investment Cost 2015 - 2030 | 2015-2020 | | 2021-2030 | |
| - Wind (Onshore) | \$ 43 mio. | | \$ 55 mio | |
| - PV (utility scale + roof top) | \$ 303 mio. | | \$ 602 mio. | |

4.7 EMPLOYMENT EFFECTS

Based on the methodology documented in Chapter 3, the employment effects have calculated for the first period until 2020 and the second one between 2021 and 2030 for both scenarios.

The RE-ADV-X would create at the peak of the construction period up to 3,600 jobs. Government policy to support apprenticeships and skills development would significantly alter the proportion of jobs that would be taken up by Narrabri Shire locals, to the existing labour force of the wider Australian solar and wind industry.

Contrary to construction and installation jobs, the operation and maintenance jobs will have to be done by Narrabri residents, as the workforce needs to be close to the power plants. A specific training and education program is required to build up a skilled workforce to operate and maintain solar photovoltaic and wind power plants in Narrabri. By 2030, around 2,500 solar and 180 wind workers will be required in the Narrabri Region. In comparison with the existing workforce of around 6,000 people in the region, the solar and wind industry can become as important as the current largest employer in the Narrabri Shire - the agriculture sector.

The RE-X still leads up to 500 jobs during the peak construction time and – in addition – between 200 to 500 jobs in operation and maintenance in 2020 - 2030 respectively. The RE-X requires around 430 solar and 50 wind workers in the Narrabri Region by 2030.

Table 12: Employment effects– Narrabri RENEWABLES ADVANCED Export (RE-ADV-X)

| | Scenario Parameter | | | | | | Employment | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| | New Installed Capacity | | Annual Generation | | Annual Investment | | Construction and installation | | Operation and maintenance | |
| | [MW/a] | | [GWh/a] | | [Million \$ / a] | | [Jobs] | | [Jobs / a] | |
| | 2015-2020 | 2021-2030 | 2020 | 2030 | 2015-2020 | 2021-2030 | 2015-2020 | 2021-2030 | 2020 | 2030 |
| Solar Photovoltaic | 267 | 134 | 1,967 | 5,412 | \$ 459 | \$ 368 | 3,466 | 1,745 | 968 | 2,663 |
| Wind power | 64 | 14 | 1,095 | 2,096 | \$ 64 | \$ 25 | 205 | 45 | 96 | 179 |
| Total | 331 | 148 | 3,062 | 7,508 | 523 | 393 | 3,671 | 1,790 | 1,064 | 2,843 |

Table 13: Employment effects– Narrabri RENEWABLES Export (RE-X)

| | Scenario Parameter | | | | | | Employment | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|
| | New Installed Capacity | | Annual Generation | | Annual Investment | | Construction and installation | | Operation and maintenance | |
| | [MW/a] | | [GWh/a] | | [Million \$ / a] | | [Jobs] | | [Jobs / a] | |
| | 2015-2020 | 2021-2030 | 2020 | 2030 | 2015-2020 | 2021-2030 | 2015-2020 | 2021-2030 | 2020 | 2030 |
| Solar Photovoltaic | 35 | 22 | 304 | 837 | \$ 61 | \$ 60 | 458 | 285 | 158 | 436 |
| Wind power | 14 | 3 | 245 | 597 | \$ 9 | \$ 6 | 46 | 10 | 22 | 52 |
| Total | 50 | 25 | 549 | 1,435 | 69 | 66 | 504 | 296 | 180 | 488 |

4.8 COMPARING NARRABRI RENEWABLE EXPORT CASES TO NARRABRI GAS PROJECT

According to Narrabri Gas Project information, the 950 km² production field is projected to produce gas with an energy content of around 74 PJ per year or approximately 8 TWh/a electricity (assumptions see 5.2.1). In case the entire area would have been used for solar photovoltaics, the output would be just over 100 TWh/a – higher than the expected output of the gas field – for as long as solar power plants would operate in that region, while the gas field will only provide energy for a limited period of time³⁰. The RENEWABLES scenarios in this analysis however have adopted a much more conservative approach and estimated potential based on current and projected future demand in the Narrabri region. Under the RE-ADV-X case, 2.98 TWh will be exported, while the RE-X case would lead to an export of 0.474 TWh annually.

Thus, income from exported electricity from Narrabri Shire to the rest of NSW will benefit the community as long as the power plants are in operation, while the gas field will be exhausted after a limited period. Furthermore, employees who operate and maintain solar and wind power plants as well as the regional power grid will have sustainable long-term jobs.

The RE-ADV-X case would require an investment of \$ 6.5 billion for the power generation capacity – just over twice as the planned investment for the gas field, but would create at least 15 times more employees for operation and maintenance on around 17% of the area the gas field would take up.

The RE-X case requires one third of the planned gas field investment, but would create around 3 times more long-term jobs in operation and maintenance than the Santos project. Furthermore, it would only require 41 km² i.e. 4% of the proposed gas field area.

³⁰ According to Santos project information, the gas field might have a possible production time of up to 25 years

5 REGIONAL ENERGY CONTEXT

5.1 POWER PLANTS IN NSW

Utility scale power plant capacities in NSW are based on coal (53%), hydro (22%) and gas (11%). The remaining 14% are solar photovoltaic, cogeneration and bio energy generators. In total, NSW has 17,055 MW of installed electricity generation capacity plus 1557 MW of solar photovoltaics; mainly small rooftop systems under 10 kW³¹ and 700 MW of wind power.

Figure 17: Installed Capacities of NSW power generation 2017





Figure 16: Proposed new power plants for the NEM area (May 2017)



5.1.1 NEW ENERGY PROJECTS IN NSW

The National Electricity Market (NEM) includes Queensland, NSW, ACT, Victoria and South Australia. Across the NEM there are new power plants with a total proposed capacity of over 23,000 MW, most of them are wind farms (12,000 MW) and solar photovoltaic plants (7,000 MW). A list of new generation projects is also available on the AEMO website³². In NSW, proposals to build power stations fall under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 7979³³, which states that new power stations shall be subject to a transparent and public assessment process to ensure protection of the environment and the health and amenity of local communities.

The environmental assessment process for electricity generation projects is the same as that for any other major project. This process requires a full environmental assessment by the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment with particular emphasis given to ensuring approved proposals proceed in an environmentally appropriate and sustainable manner. Furthermore, a National Transmission Network Development Plan³⁴ is prepared annually and provides an outlook of estimated future generation requirements over the next 20 years. Details of proposed generation plants are available at the *Department of Planning's Major Projects Register*³⁵.

As of 2017 there are two utility scale solar photovoltaic power plants in the planning phase; 60 MW *Narrabri South* and 55 MW *Wee Waa* projects.

5.2 THE PROPOSED NARRABRI GAS PROJECT

Santos is one of Australia's largest domestic gas producers and increasingly a significant gas exporter. The company is seeking approval to develop a coal-seam gas project near Narrabri. The project requires drilling up to 850 wells on 425 sites in the project area in and around the Pilliga (Figure 18). According to Santos' Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), published in February 2017, "around 60% of the project area is located

³¹ Australian Solar PV Institute, Status November 2017, <http://pv-map.apvi.org.au/historical#4/-26.67/134.12>

³² <http://www.aemo.com.au/Electricity/Planning/Related-Information/Generation-Information>


³³ <http://www.legislation.nsw.gov.au/yjewtop/jnforce/act+203+J979+FIRST+0+N/2>

³⁴ <http://www.aemo.com.au/Electricity/Planning/National-Transmission-Network-Development-Plan>

³⁵ <http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/page/project-sectors/transport--communications--energy--water/generation-of-electricity-or-heat-or-co-generation/>

on state land in a section of the Pilliga set aside by the NSW Government for uses including logging and extractive industries and does not include National Parks or Nature Reserves”. Furthermore, Santos states that they “will only drill on private land when the landholder agrees to host our activities. The operational facilities would be located on about 1000 hectares or around 1% of the 95,000-hectare (950 km²) project area”. However the impact of the operations might extend far beyond this 1%.

Figure 18: Map of the Narrabri Gas Project




Source: Santos, Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

5.2.1 SANTOS ESTIMATION: GAS PRODUCTION

Santos quantified the estimated total gas volume for this project “up to half of NSW annual gas demand” or 200 TJ per day. According to the Australian Energy Regulator, the average annual gas consumption of New South Wales between 2010 - 2015 was close to 150 PJ/a³⁶ (Figure 19). Thus the Santo gas field project might supply around 74 PJ of gas per year.

³⁶ Australian Energy Regulator, State of the Energy Market May 2017, <https://www.aer.gov.au/system/files/AER%20State%20of%20the%20energy%20market%202017%20-%20A4.pdf>

Figure 19: Domestic gas consumption in Eastern Australia



Source: AEMO, National gas forecasting report, 2016.

There are several options for how the produced gas can be used:

- Gas supply for household cooking and warm water supply
- Industry use e.g. process heat production
- In gas power plant to generate electricity for the NEM
- For export

By the time of the final editing of this report, it was still unclear how the gas will be used. In case this gas will be used in gas power plants with an average efficiency of 40%³⁷ this would lead to a generation of 8 TWh electricity. In order to compare the energy content of the gas field project with the alternative renewable energy project, the energy measured in TWh_{electric} will be used.

5.2.2 SANTOS ESTIMATION: ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT

According to the Environmental Impact Statement for the gas field, the employment at peak construction that will be sourced from Narrabri Shire or the surrounding shires will be 390 people (30% of the total estimated construction workforce of 1,300). However, during the operations phase 120 local people from the Narrabri Shire and surrounding shires will be employed (60% of 200 strong operations workforce).³⁸

The cost of gas field includes a construction nominal capital investment of \$3.6 billion, or around \$3 billion in real terms, with a net present value of \$2 billion. This is including operational costs over 25 years.³⁹

³⁷ Average efficiency gas power plant up to 39%, CCGT power plants achieve up to 58%, source: EFFICIENCY IN ELECTRICITY GENERATION, EURELECTRIC in collaboration with VGB July 2003

³⁸ Narrabri Gas Project, Environmental Impact Statement, Appendix U2 Economic Assessment https://majorprojects.accelo.com/public/486343c7aef880520e893fc8f392450/Appendix%20U2%20Economic%20assessment%20_macro-economic%20analysis_.pdf

³⁹ Narrabri Gas Project, Environmental Impact Statement, Executive Summary <https://majorprojects.accelo.com/public/599b13c8378739ff1fd1451067c2ab38/00c%20Executive%20summary.pdf>

APPENDIX

The following tables set out the costs for power generation for the range of technologies used in the modelling. These are based on up-to-date data and current market developments, as described in Chapter 3. The specific investment costs in \$/kW are detailed in Table 14 and ongoing operation and maintenance costs in \$/kW/year are shown in Table 15.

Table 14: Specific investment costs for power generation

| <i>in \$/kW</i> | | 2015 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| Power plants | Biomass and waste power plant | 3,145 | 2,969 | 2,867 | 2,750 | 2,691 |
| | Coal power plant | 1,411 | 1,390 | 1,356 | 1,321 | 1,287 |
| | Diesel generator | 907 | 907 | 907 | 907 | 907 |
| | Gas power plant | 769 | 751 | 715 | 679 | 644 |
| | Geothermal power plant | 12,579 | 9,507 | 6,509 | 5,409 | 4,652 |
| | Hydro large | 3,466 | 3,573 | 3,734 | 3,869 | 3,987 |
| | Hydro small | 3,466 | 3,573 | 3,734 | 3,869 | 3,987 |
| | Lignite power plant | 1,645 | 1,609 | 1,575 | 1,540 | 1,507 |
| | Nuclear power plant | 6,615 | 6,615 | 6,615 | 6,615 | 6,615 |
| | Ocean energy power plant | 4,710 | 3,364 | 2,340 | 1,943 | 1,730 |
| | Oil power plant | 967 | 948 | 910 | 872 | 834 |
| | PV power plant | 1,817 | 1,682 | 1,305 | 1,059 | 1,079 |
| | Solar thermal power plant | 5,787 | 4,705 | 3,799 | 3,595 | 3,479 |
| | Wind turbine offshore | 5,631 | 3,876 | 3,072 | 2,775 | 2,386 |
| | Wind turbine onshore | 1,519 | 1,316 | 1,305 | 1,312 | 1,371 |
| | | | | | | |
| CHP for Power Generation and Industry | CHP Biomass and waste | 5,150 | 4,505 | 3,934 | 3,626 | 3,445 |
| | CHP Coal | 1,950 | 1,919 | 1,872 | 1,824 | 1,777 |
| | CHP Fuel cell | 1,726 | 1,346 | 1,214 | 1,155 | 1,141 |
| | CHP Gas | 1,038 | 995 | 974 | 954 | 933 |
| | CHP Geothermal | 13,456 | 11,409 | 9,068 | 7,606 | 6,582 |
| | CHP Lignite | 1,950 | 1,919 | 1,872 | 1,824 | 1,777 |
| | CHP Oil | 1,340 | 1,312 | 1,259 | 1,205 | 1,153 |
| Buildings / Other Small Scale | CHP Biomass and waste | 2,545 | 2,486 | 2,443 | 2,418 | 2,391 |
| | CHP Coal | 1,949 | 1,919 | 1,872 | 1,824 | 1,777 |
| | CHP Fuel cell | 1,726 | 1,346 | 1,214 | 1,155 | 1,141 |
| | CHP Gas | 965 | 911 | 804 | 790 | 775 |
| | CHP Geothermal | 13,456 | 11,409 | 9,068 | 7,606 | 6,582 |
| | CHP Lignite | 1,950 | 1,919 | 1,872 | 1,824 | 1,777 |
| | CHP Oil | 1,339 | 1,312 | 1,259 | 1,205 | 1,153 |

Table 15: Operation and maintenance costs for power generation technologies

| <i>in \$/kW/a</i> | | 2015 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Power plants | Biomass and waste power plant | 189.1 | 178.3 | 172.0 | 165.5 | 162.2 |
| | Coal power plant | 30.8 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 29.7 |
| | Diesel generator | 112.6 | 112.6 | 112.6 | 112.6 | 112.6 |
| | Gas power plant | 23.7 | 22.1 | 20.6 | 18.6 | 17.8 |
| | Geothermal power plant | 548.6 | 426.6 | 324.4 | 302.9 | 286.7 |
| | Hydro large | 139.0 | 143.3 | 149.2 | 155.0 | 159.4 |
| | Hydro small | 139.0 | 143.3 | 149.2 | 155.0 | 159.4 |
| | Lignite power plant | 27.1 | 26.5 | 25.9 | 25.4 | 24.9 |
| | Nuclear power plant | 162.0 | 162.0 | 162.0 | 162.0 | 162.0 |
| | Ocean energy power plant | 188.7 | 134.7 | 93.0 | 78.2 | 69.0 |
| | Oil power plant | 22.4 | 21.7 | 20.3 | 18.8 | 17.4 |
| | PV power plant | 38.7 | 21.9 | 15.4 | 14.7 | 15.4 |
| | Solar thermal power plant | 350.9 | 270.0 | 233.8 | 215.0 | 196.4 |
| | Wind turbine offshore | 209.5 | 164.5 | 133.6 | 126.6 | 108.9 |
| Wind turbine onshore | 56.5 | 55.9 | 56.8 | 59.8 | 62.6 | |
| | | | | | | |
| CHP for Power Generation | CHP Biomass and waste | 361.3 | 315.9 | 275.0 | 254.5 | 241.3 |
| | CHP Coal | 68.7 | 67.3 | 65.8 | 64.4 | 62.9 |
| | CHP Gas | 42.4 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| | CHP Geothermal | 487.1 | 409.5 | 342.3 | 298.4 | 272.1 |
| | CHP Lignite | 81.9 | 80.4 | 77.5 | 76.1 | 73.1 |
| | CHP Oil | 48.3 | 46.8 | 43.9 | 42.4 | 41.0 |
| CHP for Industry | CHP Biomass and waste | 93.6 | 83.4 | 74.6 | 68.7 | 62.9 |
| | CHP Coal | 68.7 | 67.3 | 65.8 | 64.4 | 62.9 |
| | CHP Fuel cell | 86.3 | 67.3 | 61.4 | 58.5 | 57.0 |
| | CHP Gas | 42.4 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| | CHP Geothermal | 239.9 | 231.1 | 222.3 | 220.9 | 219.4 |
| | CHP Lignite | 81.9 | 80.4 | 77.5 | 76.1 | 73.1 |
| | CHP Oil | 48.3 | 46.8 | 43.9 | 42.4 | 41.0 |
| CHP for Buildings / Other Small Scale | CHP Biomass and waste | 101.7 | 99.5 | 98.0 | 96.5 | 95.1 |
| | CHP Coal | 68.0 | 67.3 | 65.8 | 64.4 | 62.9 |
| | CHP Fuel cell | 86.3 | 67.3 | 61.4 | 58.5 | 57.0 |
| | CHP Gas | 38.8 | 36.6 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 30.7 |
| | CHP Geothermal | 239.9 | 231.1 | 222.3 | 220.9 | 219.4 |


| | | | | | |
|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| CHP Lignite | 81.9 | 80.4 | 77.5 | 76.1 | 73.1 |
|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|

Table 16 provides a list of major existing, under construction and proposed NSW power stations larger than 30 MW of installed capacity. A full list of current NSW generators registered with the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) are available at the AEMO website⁴⁰.

Table 16: New South Wales power plants

| Power Plants in New South Wales/ Australia | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Power station | Max. Capacity [MW] | Technology | Fuel |
| Moree Solar Farm, Moree, NSW | 56 | Photovoltaic | solar |
| Royalia Solar Farm, Royalia NSW | 20 | Photovoltaic | solar |
| Nyngan Solar Plant, Nyngan, NSW | 102 | Photovoltaic | solar |
| Broken Hill Solar Plant, Broken Hill, NSW | 53 | Photovoltaic | solar |
| Mugga Lane Solar Park, Canberra, ACT | 13 | Photovoltaic | solar |
| Gullen Range Solar Farm, Crookwell, NSW | 10 | Photovoltaic | solar |
| Power station | Max. Capacity | Technology | Fuel |
| Baywater | 2,640 | Coal Power | bituminous |
| Eraing | 2,880 | Coal Power | bituminous |
| Liddell | 2,000 | Coal Power | bituminous |
| Mt Piper | 1,400 | Coal Power | bituminous |
| Vales Point B | 1,320 | Coal Power | bituminous |
| Power station | Max. Capacity | Technology | Fuel |
| Colongra | 667 | Gas Power Plant | natural gas |
| Liddell | 50 | Gas Power Plant | fuel oil |
| Tallawarra | 435 | Gas Power Plant | natural gas |
| Smithfield | 176 | Gas Power Plant | natural gas |
| Uranquinty | 641 | Gas Power Plant | natural gas |
| Power station | Max. Capacity | Technology | Fuel |
| Appin Mine | 55.6 | Gas Power Plant | coalbed methane+natural gas |
| Belrose | 4 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Earthpower Camellia | 3.9 | Gas Power Plant | biogas |
| Jacks Gully | 2.3 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Lucas Heights I | 5.4 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Lucas Heights II | 17.3 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Sydney Water, Malabar | 3 | Gas Power Plant | sewage gas |
| Shoalhaven Landfill Gas Project | 1 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Tatmor [1] | 7 | Gas Power Plant | coalbed methane |
| Teralba | 8 | Gas Power Plant | coalbed methane |
| Tower Mine | 41.2 | Gas Power Plant | coalbed methane+natural gas |
| Wilga | 11 | Gas Power Plant | natural gas |
| Woodlawn | 4 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Kinumber Landfill Gas Abatement [1] | 1 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Woy Woy Landfill Gas Abatement [2] | 1 | Gas Power Plant | landfill gas |
| Power station | Max. Capacity | Technology | Fuel |
| Bendeela (Shoalhaven) | 80 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Blowering | 80 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Brown Mountain | 4.95 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Burrendong | 14.5 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Burrinjuck | 27 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Copeton | 24 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Glenbawn | 5.8 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Guthega | 60 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Hume | 58 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Kangaroo Valley (Shoalhaven) | 160 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Keepit | 7.2 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Kembla Grange | 6.8 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Murray 1 | 950 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Murray 2 | 550 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Nymboida | 5 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Oaky River | 12 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Pindari | 5.6 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| The Drop, Mulwala Canal | 2.5 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Turnut 1 | 330 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Turnut 2 | 287 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Turnut 3 | 1500 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Warragamba | 50 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Williams River Dam (private) | 7 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Wyangala | 22.5 | Hydro Power Plant | water |
| Power station | Max. Capacity | Technology | Fuel |
| Broadwater Sugar Mill | 10 | Bio energy Power Plant | bagasse |
| Broadwater Biomass Co-Gen | 30 | Bio energy Power Plant | bagasse/wood waste |
| Condong Sugar Mill | 3 | Bio energy Power Plant | bagasse |
| Condong Biomass Co-Gen | 30 | Bio energy Power Plant | bagasse/wood waste |
| Harwood Sugar Mill | 4.5 | Bio energy Power Plant | bagasse |
| Visy Paper, Tumut | 21 | Bio energy Power Plant | black liquor |
| Power station | Max. Capacity | Technology | Fuel |
| Ancor, Bomaderry | 6 | CoGen | |
| BlueScope Steel, Port Kembla | 62 | CoGen | |
| Macquarie University | 1.5 | CoGen | |
| Stadium Australia | 1 | CoGen | |
| University of Western Sydney | 1 | CoGen | |
| Visy Paper, Smithfield | 6 | CoGen | |
| Decommissioned Power station | Max. Capacity | Technology | Fuel |
| Munmorah | 1,400 | | bituminous |
| Redbank | 150 | | bituminous (tailings) |
| Wallerawang | 1,240 | | bituminous |
| Total Capacity | 17,056 | | |

⁴⁰ <http://www.aemo.com.au/About-the-Industry/Registration/Current-Registration-and-Exemption-Lists>



Institute for Sustainable Futures