

From: [B White](#)
To: [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: Thunderbolt (SDD 10807896)
Date: Thursday, 11 April 2024 9:49:28 PM

Thunderbolt- the proposal and a response to additional comment supplied by the proponent.

Water.

The proponent overestimates the water resource. Water is a finite resource in the upper reaches of our river systems. Screwing our waterways for construction of projects such as those proposed by Neon, by way of the Thunderbolt project, cites their strategies to utilise the water as an unlimited resource to their project.

Ultimately all aspects of construction and access require water, however the mere proposal itself interferes with the natural flow of inflowing waters and compromises the associated soaks and streams. Such interference must not be underestimated, especially when considering the increased 'drying out effect' of any completed components once turbines are operational.

The construction of public access roads and especially the private internal road construction will devastate the natural contour, thereby reconstruing the flow of waters, disrupting the sources to the dam. They acknowledge the risks by provision of such elaborate "remediation" work at the points of access, pumping and piping water, is proposed. What has failed to be accounted is the damage, implicit in the very intricacies of the mode of operation that they seek to defend.

Turtles

The claim implying that "snapping turtles" cannot be any worse off under the construction regime is ludicrous. Serious work to maintain and reintroduce these creatures has been undertaken and monitored across a wide area. One cannot believe that if just one project were to interfere with their survival, the cumulative impact of multiple proposed projects, would not further contribute to their demise. Missing is the recognition that this project may not be the only one that impacts the turtle population, which, challenged as you note, by the unfenced grazing routines, in which they currently manage to survive, the proponent fails to account for the added risks and impacts on an already stressed "Bell's Turtle" population. In addition the multiple impacts across accumulated project site and even multiple projects adding even potentially more interference.

Fire

You fail to grasp the seriousness of fire in the regional, non -urban portions of Australia.. The impact of the potential fire risk is completely underestimated. Suggesting that the turbines can be stopped positioning blades to minimise risk is outrageous. The old adage "*where there is smoke there is fire*" – has to be turned around here. "*Where there is fire there is smoke*". Irrespective of the position of the blade , or indeed the location of the turbine – in a smoke filled location NO aerial assistance can be relied upon to safely support on ground operations, be it the role to extinguish; as cover or to save our firefighters.

The imagery and understanding of rural firefighting is absent, is illogical and therefore not adequately addressed in any way shape or form. Once again the cumulative impact of potentially multiple projects in the local area underestimate the demand on local sections of the Fire Service.

In Conclusion:-

Not only is the potential impact to be felt in the waterways, the highways and the byways it will be felt strongly in the associated districts from labour and accommodation which already strain to accommodate an existing workforce. If you imagine that the homeless only sleep on the street in the cities, think again. This is a current and strongly emerging problem in rural areas too- a situation that can only be exacerbated by the introduction of a new "bulk" workforce.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Elizabeth White

11/04/2024