



NEIL KILLION	OBJECT	Submission No: 162005
<p>Organisation: <i>Climate and Energy Realists Queensland - Affiliated with the National Rational Energy Network</i></p>	<p>Key issues: <i>Energy Transition, Biodiversity, Visual impacts, Noise and vibration, Heritage, Agricultural impacts and land use, Social and economic, Physiological - infrasound noise / electromagnetic interference / shadow flicker / blade glint</i></p>	
<p>Location: <i>Queensland 4217</i></p>		
<p>Submitter Type: <i>None of the above apply to me OR I am making a submission in relation to advice the Commission has been asked to provide</i></p>		
<p>Attachment:</p>		

Submission date: 20240302 14:31:00

This proposal to build some 30 wind-based projects in an area of the highest environmental sensitivity and threatened biodiversity is a shameful act by a Government acting in willful disregard of the true facts about both climatic variations and energy competency. It is no surprise to see the name NEOEN attached as they were the proponents of the equally monstrous developments at Kaban and Chalumbin, which were subjects of much community-based opposition and in many cases personal despair.

This is a heartless and ill thought-through attempt to ride roughshod over local citizens' lives and livelihoods. Not to mention that Wind Factories (as they should be called) are neither clean, nor green and they're anything but cheap. The Gen Cost figures do not include many costs due to transmission and intermittency. They have to be continuously backed-up by baseload power (and in fact need diesel to get them going). They need a constant prevailing wind, neither too slow nor too fast. They contain toxic metals and dangerous substances like Bisphenol A (which sheds in nanoparticles). They are basically wildlife killing machines responsible for countless innocent animals being slaughtered. They can never replace 24/7 reliable, cheap and environmentally friendly traditional organic fuels.

Wind has been an international failure for these very reasons. Offshore or onshore it achieves nothing in terms of replacing traditional organic energy. Some \$5 trillion (and you should let this number sink in) has been spent over the last 20-30 years to effect a pointless replacement for what already works very well and it has only moved the overall world energy sources around 2-3%.

Now I'm not aware if this project will impact food-producing land, but if it does you should also be aware that what you are proposing to do 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."

Regards,

Neil Killion

Co-Founder and Organiser,

Climate and Energy Realists Queensland

Web Page climateandenergyrealists.com

Email:- [REDACTED]