

**Submission
No 16**

**INQUIRY INTO FEASIBILITY OF UNDERGROUNDING
THE TRANSMISSION INFRASTRUCTURE FOR
RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS**

Name: Mr Roy Currie

Date Received: 8 July 2023

I object to this project because and is not presented in order of importance :

The loss of food producing land of which Australia only has 4% of its total land mass as arable land the massive economic loss to the local community

EIS's are skewed to the proponent, therefore untrustworthy, because....

EIS's are taken by the grantors of the project as an absolute consideration of all aspects of the project the environmental contamination of land by heavy metals therefore, it can never be rehabilitated back to safe prime ag land there is no fail-safe proviso that the end-of-life rehabilitation cost will be borne by the owner/lessees at that time protecting the local rate payer. there is no proviso for the recycling of blades panels. batteries and other failing infrastructure that the slave labour used to manufacture the panels etc is ignored the complex is subject to leaking toxic substances into local water ways

It is highly subsidised by the taxpayer for the benefit of off shore entities in reality, the practicalities of the present concept of re-newable energy production/storage are an ill-conceived, hysterical and impossible practical goal to achieve with irreversible social, economic and environmental consequences. At a stretch, all these renewable projects are very vulnerable to enemy attack, consequently very easy to render inoperable with little risk and more so when close to the coast as this one is. For your own education, and maybe others, peruse the attachments.