Ref: SSD-67478479 **Yanco Battery Energy Storage System**

ACEnergy Pty Ltd Level 3, 689 Burke Rd, Camberwell VIC 3124

Development of a 250 MW / 1100 MWh battery energy storage system and associated infrastructure and connection works

I pass comments re the EIS which decidedly biased in favor of the proponent, which is only natural as the proponent pays the bill. No independent EIS here and it is not subject to independent analysis as the government is desperate for this and other renewable projects to proceed at any cost. The presentations are presented in a such a way as to point out the real and not so real positives of the project whilst many legitimate concerns are glossed over, minimised, or ignored in an effort not to "stir up the locals" by withholding information, minimal public consultation, presenting minimal media information, that only presents the project in a positive light, in short, not a balanced, HONEST explanation, in other words, obtaining and proceeding by stealth!

Even the objector numbers are virtually ignored. It is very arrogant of the Dept to make comments about the locals when the locals aware of the project. Notwithstanding that there were 64 submissions with 63 objections, which the Department immediately assumes that there were no local objections, thus proving the lack of public consultation with the locals. Sixty three objections be they a 100k or 1000k, local or otherwise is quite a number to be treated as having no value, The Department does not understand that this type of energy production has no future. Some of these objectors are engineers that can calculate the futility of this taxpayer subsidised, guaranteed investment return to the overseas proponents.

Good deal? For the investor, yes, for Australia, no!

We are fed the line that the project can power 85,000 homes, very impressive, but how long can the site power the 85,000 homes?
Minutes?
An hour?
A day?
Can it power 85,000 homes overnight?
What is the actual teal return to the community? If there is any return, can it match the economic loss to the community? The reported pitiful three million dollars does even begin to compensate for the economic, and social losses.

How much of the battery recharge is from the grid?
How much of the battery recharge is from the renewable sector of energy production?
Can you even measure the **true** contribution of each source?
Where is the water sourced from?
What measures for water are in place when we have another millennial type drought?
Who will attend a fire incident?
I have been a fire brigade member for over 45 years but I and many colleagues will not be attending an incident on a BESS thermal fire or a solar generator, as dealing fires is very dangerous and the fumes from the burning batteries can be lethal, hence my comments re the school, the residences and the village.

Copied form the EIS:
Over the next 23 years (expected lifespan of the Project), the climate is projected to change, potentially resulting in more days of higher fire danger than previously experienced, and projected FDR exceeding current levels (Douglas, G. 2017). Planning for long term infrastructure should include consideration of the potential for increased fire danger and potentially higher fire frequencies.

The BESS development site has a total area of approximately 10.3 hectares of development footprint (in which the BESS compound covers approximately 8 hectares) and will be located towards the northeastern boundary of the host lots. The development site is currently used for agricultural activities and primary production.

NOTE: Copied from the EIS:
1.4 Related Development A review of the Leeton Shire Council DA tracker on the 6th of August 2024 for the site address of 120 Houghton Road returned no search results for past development applications on the site. The applicant is not aware of any existing development consents related to the development site

It would appear that the Department has intentionally overlooked or did not search well enough to come up with this project which, according to the link, is in the process of preparing an EIS. LSC is aware of this project also.

Comet Park BESS
Samsung C & T Renewable Energy Australia
Proposed 150 MW Battery Energy Storage System
Link - https://www.cometparkbess.com/

This project would be side by side with the ACE development and yet it is given only a passing mention – see proposal map. If this project is allowed, the foot print becomes approximately 18 ha of land lost to production and damaged forever by these batteries and my range of concerns only increase with the possibility of this project proceeding.

Some key points minimised, glossed over. or ignored by the EIS:

- the YAHS, which is four prevailing downwind kilometers away
- food producing arable land next door, including YAHS land,
- residences less than a kilometer
- the village of Yanco, 1500 metres distance.
- The source of water
- The true economic loss

<u>This moral aspect is not even mentioned:</u>

The lip service that all governments, supporters, and proponents ignore, is the human cost of producing the materials for these projects. They conveniently ignore the international conventions concerning slave and

child labor from which the greatest majority of the raw materials are sourced. There is little consideration given to the “clean up” at end of life of these projects, the irreversible soil damage done to arable food producing soils.

JUST FOLLOW THE DOLLAR is the only criteria!

A very important consideration that is conveniently ignored is who pays for the clean up?
Where and how are the expired components treated? Recycled? Can they be recycled? Buried? What is done with the millions of tonnes of concrete and massive steel reinforcement?

Not applicable to this fiasco, but wind generator turbines need gear box oil changes, having spills contaminating the surrounds, transport of used and new replacement oils. The larger turbines use about 3600 litres of lubricating oil that is drained and replaced about every 9 to 16 months, and 4500 litres of transformer oil, which is periodically tested and changed if the tests how a problem.

How do the affected communities survive or even porsper? The loss of population as the vacuum left by the families who are forced to move elsewhere, affecting school, government services, loss of agricultural production and the social fabric.

The whole renewable concept is basic “pie in the sky” amid a world of braying donkeys screaming the Chicken Little equivalent of – “the sky is falling”, frightening children, frightening those who do not or cannot analyse the concept of this folly. Sure, a measured approach to renewable is to be commended but not this headlong rush that will destroy our nation.

Go figure!

Roy Currie – [redacted]