From:	[redacted]
To:	Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox
Subject:	Hills of Gold Wind Farm
Date:	Sunday, 30 June 2024 12:24:18 PM
Attachments:	Wind Farm Objections.docx

Please find attached a document describing my concerns about this project.

Geoffrey D Houston, PhD(Phys)
[redacted]
Diddillibah,
Qld 4559

mob [redacted]

This submission consists of two parts:

1. Objections to Wind “Farms” and BESS.
2. The case against NetZero and subsidized renewables.

Part 1

Objections to Wind “Farms” and BESS.

The intent of this submission is to identify seriously negative aspects of any Wind “Farm” and BESS.

1. Waste of Productive Farmland

Australia’s farmland provides vital food and fibre to a crowded world. Using many hectares to accommodate an expensive electricity plant is a waste of farming resources. At the least, fire protection of the farm is compromised as well as normal equipment mobility which now must fit in with the needs of the wind turbines.

Coal fired or nuclear generation is a much denser source of energy and occupies much less space. Let’s end the renewables obsession and allow normal market forces (not Renewable Energy Certificates) to rebuild a cheap, clean and reliable grid.

2. Conflict with Paris Accord

If this project will impact food-producing land, this is in contravention of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement which states that:- "Taking over farmland to build facilities to produce intermittent energy is a violation of Article 2(b) of the Paris Agreement."

3. Wind Power is Very Expensive

We are frequently told that renewables are the cheapest form of electricity. We know this from CSIRO’s GenCost24. This despite the fact that ever since Australia started installing renewables electricity prices have risen relentlessly. There are many Costs Not Accounted for by GenCost24.
Below is a list of items that can be assigned monetary values. They are all required to achieve the installation of a high percentage of renewables in our grid. They are excluded from GenCost24.

- Damage to our ridge lines and landscape views by huge numbers of windmills.
- Local heating resulting from windmills and solar farms.
- Loss of farmland on a huge scale.
- Breakdown of local communities due to the aggressive theft of their space.

- Bushfire danger to farms and open spaces due to transmission lines restricting vehicular access.
- Loss of native flora and fauna on a country-wide scale.
- Vast tracts of land will be cleared and roads and Windmills/solar panels will march across the land.
- Apparently it is recommended to use a sharp blow on sites in Queensland to "finish off" injured Koalas (Ref 1).
- It is well known that birds and bats are routinely killed and injured by windmills.
- The environmental and greenhouse costs of manufacturing windmills and solar panels in China.
- The threat to Australia's security by being so dependent on China which would not hesitate to switch off our grid if it was in China's interest.
- The cost and environmental cost, of disposal and replacement of batteries, windmills and solar panels after their short lifetimes of 10, 20 and 25 years respectively.
- The cost of the insurance premium that covers the probable situation when the final owner of these assets is bankrupt and the cleanup must be supported by the taxpayers.

4. BESS: Dangers of an Unnecessary Battery

Batteries are needed for "firming" and short term backup, due to the unreliable nature of renewable solar and wind. They provide back-up measured in minutes, not hours, and will be totally ineffective in the case of a major power outage. They need to be continuously backed up by traditional energy, which entails needless expense at times it's not required.

Lithium batteries are dangerous and toxic if they combust, as demonstrated by the Bouldercombe fire recently. The battery is not required in a network with sufficient coal, nuclear and gas generation.

5. Cost of an Unnecessary Battery eg 250 Mwh

According to the International Energy Agency (IEA), the cost of building a modern coal-fired power plant can range from $1.8 million to $4.5 million per megawatt of installed capacity. Based on the highest cost in this range, $4.5M/megawatt, a coal fired power station to generate 24/7 power of 250 megawatts, would cost $1.125B to build and would last at least 40 years.

On the other hand, a BESS will cost $640M/GWh, in 1 hour bursts every so often[2]. For 250 megawatt hours, this comes to $160M. But BESS will last only 10 years before

disposal (which has a large environmental cost) and replacement. So to match coal's lifetime with extremely intermittent on-demand firming, we need to spend 4x160=$ 640M. Plus disposal costs.

In summary BESS provides occasional power for ½ the capital spend required for 24/7 power from a coal-fired power plant.

6. Summary

In sections 1-5 some glaring disadvantages of Wind "Farms" including a BESS have been highlighted in the form of fire danger, excessive cost and waste and poisoning of our land.

Ref 1

https://arr.news/2023/12/01/killing-koalas-to-save-polar-bears-robert-onfray/

Part 2

The case against NetZero and subsidized renewables.

The intention of this submission is to express and justify the view that any Solar/Wind Farm and BESS and the entire NetZero renewables revolution of our electricity grid should be scrapped.

It is contended that the commitment to NetZero, and to coal exiting the system, is not justified. There is no need for the coal exit and NetZero is a folly which will destroy our economy and leave us weak at a dangerous time in history.

1. CO_2 Coalition.

To establish the claim that NetZero is unjustified, the work of a distinguished organisation: The CO_2 Coalition[2] will be referenced. Here is how the coalition describes itself:

"The CO_2 Coalition was established in 2015 as a non-partisan educational foundation operating under Section 501(c)(3) of the IRS code for the purpose of educating thought leaders, policy makers, and the public about the important contribution made by carbon dioxide to our lives and the economy. The Coalition seeks to engage in an informed and dispassionate discussion of climate change, humans' role in the climate system, the limitations of climate models, and the consequences of mandated reductions in CO2 emissions."

The board of this Coalition comprises 3 PhD Physicists, including Clauser, the 2022 Nobel prize winner. The board has Phd's in Nuclear Engineering, Chemistry, Oil Markets, and World Politics. Also on the board are Moore (founder of Greenpeace), and the founder of a semi-conductor company. These people are extremely well qualified to understand the scientific issues as well as the politics. They receive no benefit from their efforts on the Coalition, unlike most of those who promote subsidised implementation of renewables. The next two sections refer to their work.

2. CO_2 Sensitivity.

A key issue is to understand what temperature rise to expect as a result of a doubling of atmospheric CO2. This is referred to as Climate Sensitivity. IPCC still maintains it is between 1.5 and 4.5 deg C. According to foremost climate scientist Richard Lindzen from the CO2 Coalition Publications, Lindzen[3] methodically shows how it is at or most probably below 1.5 deg C. This increase is harmless and probably beneficial. This is really all the information needed to show we are wasting resources in restricting use of fossil fuels in any way.

With such a low CO_2 Sensitivity there is no indication that using all available fossil fuels will cause dangerous global warming. The result of switching from coal fired power to renewables, assuming it results in lower CO_2, is an imperceptible change to temperature and huge damage to our environment, waste of farmland and a reduced standard of living.

3. How Did we get NetZero so Wrong?

In order to understand how the world's decision makers have been led to agree on NetZero, it is instructive to refer to another publication of the CO_2 Coalition, namely Ref 4: Challenging "NetZero" with Science.

The authors show how studies leading to exaggeration of the effects of CO_2 on climate have resulted from use of fabricated data, as well as ignoring contrary data. It shows how climate models are not capable of making the predictions they claim. The NetZero proponents also ignore the benefits of CO_2 and ignore costs associated with renewables.

The whole paper is worthy of scrutiny as it explains from a scientific perspective, how we arrived at this dangerous and unjustified decision point.

4. Summary

In section 1 an unbiased and well qualified source of climate science was introduced, the CO_2 Coalition. In sections 2 and 3 it was explained how we got NetZero wrong and how curtailing use of fossil fuel is entirely unjustified.

5. Conclusion

There is an urgent need for brave, honest leadership to call time on this waste of our resources and manpower. It is leading to a dark future with decreasing quality of life and insecurity. The warning signals are there for those who observe objectively. Huge farmer strikes in Europe have resulted in minor official capitulation[5]. Offshore wind farm sales in USA have almost halted[6]. Dozens of land-based renewables projects in USA, enabled by Biden's policies, are stalled due to grid connection issues and costs[7]. The increase in EV sales has stalled in California and Great Britain[8].

The longer Australia waits to cease the NetZero transition and revert to a modern electrical grid with redundancy and safeguards to cope with inevitable interruptions, the more expensive it will be. Don't leave our children to deal with this damage. Cancel this and every other renewable project designed to reach the worthless NetZero target.

Ref 2

https://co2coalition.org/

Ref 3

https://co2coalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/On-Climate-Sensitivity.pdf

Ref 4

https://co2coalition.org/publications/challenging-net-zero-with-science/

Ref 5

https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/tractors-roll-into-downtown-prague-czech-farmers-join-protests-2024-02-19/

Ref 6

https://www.eenews.net/articles/offshore-wind-faces-more-financial-turbulence-in-2024/

Ref 7

https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/23/climate/renewable-energy-us-electrical-grid.html

Ref 8

https://www.wsj.com/business/autos/electric-vehicle-demand-charts-7d3089c7