From: John McGrath
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Spicer"s Creek wind and battery storage facility IPC Submission John McGrath

Date:	Friday, 6 September 2024 2:26:42 PM
Attachments:	Personal Spicers Creek IPC Submissions JM 6th September 2024.pdf THE PARIS AGREEMENT.docx THE PARIS AGREEMENT.docx

Dear Spicers Creek IPC Please find attached in PDF form my submission against the Spicers creek wind generation plant and battery storage facility.
To support my submission;
Attached copy of Paris Agreement 2015 acknowledged by the Australian Government
Best regards John McGrath

John McGrath
[redacted]
Yass NSW 2582
[redacted]
[redacted]
6th September 2024

NSW Government
Independent Planning Commission

Dear Spicer's Creek wind farm and battery storage facility Independent Planning Commission
I object to the Spicers Creek Wind Generation Works SSD-41134610 for the following reasons;

1. Firstly, as the Spicers Creek Wind Generation Works and battery Storage facility is to be constructed on rural land as self-described in the promotional information for this project "Grazing and cropping land?"

Article 2.1(b) of the 2015 Paris Agreement to which Australia is signatory to which states "Increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production?"

Clearly, construction of the Spicers Creek Wind Generation Works and battery Storage Facility on self-described "Sheep and Cattle grazing and dryland cropping" reference Spicers Creek Wind farm Application Number 01488 Section 3.1.2 is at odds with Article 2,1 (b) the Paris Agreement? Thus, construction of Spicers Creek Wind Generation Works should progress no further for that reason alone?

2.Then there is the known environmentally damming issue of soil and water way contamination via shedding heavy metals, fibres either or fibreglass and carbon fibre plus toxic resins, Bisphenol A to name a few pollutant issues, from the wind turbines. Combine that with the known chemical content of the associated battery this project is an environmental nightmare?

Should these contaminates enter the drainage into Burrendong Dam and eventually these pollutants impact water supplies further down the Macquarie River to, household water supplies, stock and cropping regions downstream? Meaning that downstream whole farming businesses can be ruined, meaning due to contamination the whole rural enterprise can be put out of business, in the greater Murray Darling River systems?

Combine that with the irrevocable issue that soil disturbance on such a massive scale (wind turbine footing excavations, plinth and footing excavations, access roads, substation and transmission line clearance) will have a detrimental impact on sedimentation to all waterways feeding into the greater Murray Darling River system?

The high suspension sediment concentration can affect aquatic biota? Furthering a reason why the Spicers Creek Wind Turbine Project should not proceed?

2. Then it is well known that the fast-spinning blades of an operational wind turbine kill flying birds, with the following local bird species, already in a fragile "state of flux" will be further adversely impacted?
   Multiple bird species impacted by Spicers Creek Wind Generation Works, viz

- Diamond Fire tailed Finch *Stagonopleura guttata* EPBC Status Venerable
- Glossy Black Cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami* Vulnerable
- Little Eagle *Hieraaetus morphnoidies* Vulnerable
- Painted Buttonquail *Turnix varius* Vulnerable
- Superb Parrot *Polytelis swainsonii* EPBC Status Nationally Vulnerable
- Swift Parrot *Lathamus discolor* Critically Endangered
- White-throated Needletail *Hirundapus caudacutus* Vulnerable

Reference Bird List Wellington to September 2024
NB. EPBC= Australian Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999
Fast spinning wind turbine blades are known bird maimers and outright killers?

3. Squadron Energy claim via their document Umwelt Squadron Energy Wind Farm Summary, under section "Why is this Project Needed?" that Spicers Creek Wind farm will produce "cleaner, **cheaper,** reliable electricity" as do many others believe that energy produced by sources such as wind turbines is the cheapest form of energy?

Please read the report below by Dr Robert Barr AM who is a consulting engineer, that dispels renewables as cheap power source?

See attached. Dr Robert Barr of Electric Power Consulting published Reliable Affordable Power Generation Booklet in August 2018. You will see six cases of energy generation scenarios (updated 10 October 2019). I've attached:

- Case 1 – Existing NEM (at 10/11/19) – Large Industrial Customers - $111.12/MWh. Small LV Customers - $211.12/MWH. Extra transmission and related costs - $4.04/MWh
- Case 3 – Replace all coal with nuclear – Large Industrial Customers - $132.48/MWh. Small LV Customers - $232.48/MWh. Extra transmission and related costs - $4.04/MWh
- Case 4 – AEMO Neutral costs – Large Industrial Customers - $289.68. Small LV Customers- $389.69/MWh. Extra transmission and related costs - $81.39/MWh
- Case 6 - 100% Renewables with Solar, Wind and Hydro – Supported by Pumped Hydro – Large Industrial Customers - $457.75/MWh. Small LV Customers - $557.75/MWh. Extra transmission and related costs - $135.28/MWh

I implore the Spicers Creek wind generation and battery storage facility IPC Panellists to take in to account my points here please when considering the future of this project and outright reject the complete Spicers Creek Project.
Best regards John McGrath

THE PARIS AGREEMENT - 2015

The Parties to this Agreement,

Being Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, hereinafter referred to as “the Convention”,

Article 2

1. This Agreement, in enhancing the implementation of the Convention, including its objective, aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty, including by:

a. Holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 °C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change;

b. **Increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production;**