

**Subject:** Re: RE submission (SE-105361) on the Snowy 2.0 - Main Works

Dear Anthony,

Thank you for your quick response and the offer to include my submission. I do appreciate your assistance with this and would like it to be categorised as an Objection to the development proposal. I am comfortable with my name being included and can assure you that I have not made a political donation.

Please let me know if you need anything further in relation to my submission which is set out below within this email. Many thanks again.

Regards, Brigid Dowsett

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission. I wish to strongly object to the Snowy 2.0 project due to the extreme and damaging impacts this infrastructure will have on a fragile ecosystem, as indicated by the EIS. Kosciusko National Park is already under severe pressure from feral animals and the effects of a changing climate and requires protection from such major disruption as is being proposed.

I understand the 'project area' is 250,000 ha, one third of Kosciusko National Park and three times the size of metropolitan Sydney, and that the EIS significantly understates the extent of the environmental impact on the Park. When vegetation clearance, earthworks, dumping and damage to streams and water-dependent ecosystems are included, the affected area will exceed 10,000 ha, with the Main Works involving destruction of 992 ha of threatened species habitat and the clearing of 1,053 ha of native vegetation. The major infrastructure, including widening and construction of 100 km of roads and tracks proposed throughout the project area will destroy some sensitive environmental and geological areas. This is entirely unacceptable in a National Park and an exception should not be made for this project.

14 million cubic metres of excavated spoil, some containing asbestos and/or being acidic, is proposed to be dumped within the National Park, most of it into Talbingo and Tantangara reservoirs which will reduce their storage capacity, with the remainder to be for roads or 'landscaping' within the Park. Kosciuszko National Park is one of our best loved and most frequently visited Parks in Australia. Snowy 2.0 will confront future visitors with its visual blight on the pristine montane landscape from vantage points over thousands of square kilometres. No visitor wants to see transmission lines and major civil engineering structures in a natural landscape or will want to fish in Tantangara, with the introduced pest species transported from Talbingo reservoir. Noxious pests and weeds will be spread throughout the Snowy Scheme and downstream. The impacts from reduced water inflows to Snowy reservoirs and river systems will further threaten their quality and volume with ongoing damaging effects on vital habitats and vulnerable native species.

The EIS contains an incomplete and inadequate assessment of alternatives to Snowy 2.0. It is unacceptable that such an environmentally destructive development be proposed without an exhaustive exploration of viable alternatives. Snowy Hydro claims that Snowy 2.0 will benefit the renewable energy sector. However, for the next decade or so, most of the electricity for Snowy 2.0 pumping will still come from coal-fired power stations. This means Snowy 2.0 will be a net consumer of electricity, not a generator, with 'round-trip' losses of 30%, plus another 10% for transmission. Not only is Snowy 2.0 extremely environmentally disastrous, it is not economic and

will become a White Elephant. I understand the original \$2 billion cost estimate is now approaching \$10 billion, including transmission. Many other pumped storage opportunities have been identified in NSW with a combined capacity considerably greater than Snowy 2.0. Why were these alternatives, together with batteries and other forms of storage, not explored before proposing construction of such a huge and damaging project within a National Park.

I find it very disturbing that a project of such massive dimensions and environmental destruction has been proposed in the middle of a precious and highly valued National Park. Australia needs mass energy storage as part of a transition into renewable energy but Snowy 2.0 is not the answer. It is definitely the wrong project in the wrong place and cannot be permitted to proceed.