

KURRI KURRI PIPELINE SUBMISSION

I object to the Kurri Kurri Lateral Pipeline for the following reasons

SOCIAL IMPACTS

Kurri Kurri is a town where unemployment is high. Over the 30 years of the gas plant's expected working life, the plant will provide only ten permanent jobs and the pipeline, five jobs.

The plant located near the town and the pipeline will emit fugitive emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas.

The compressor station needs to run for 24 hours to refuel the storage pipeline and the noise will be extremely disruptive for anyone living in the surrounding areas.

Polluting industries near a town have an impact on resident's health and well-being, particularly small children. Clean industries are unlikely to establish businesses in a polluted town. Kurri Kurri families are destined to be stuck in a cycle of poverty, with no clean secure jobs and polluted air for the next 30 years if this project as it stands is approved.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

All gas pipelines release fugitive emissions due to poor quality construction and soil movement. [International studies](#) have found big errors in methane emissions and [Australian studies](#) too. Soon a satellite will reveal all.

Before a pipeline can be laid, a 50m or 25m area of land has to be cleared, fragmenting wildlife's known food source areas. The soil is compacted by heavy machinery. Years later little vegetation will grow over it, providing little cover for wildlife to hunt for food.

The soil over the pipeline can become boggy than normal in wet conditions, limiting owner's access to their property. Subsidence over the pipeline can also be problematic for machinery and may cause rain water to flow to areas it previously hasn't.

ECONOMIC IMPACTS

The EIS does not allow for the pipeline and storage bottle to carry hydrogen or a hydrogen blended fuel. However, "[Clean hydrogen is a priority low emissions technology](#) under the government's Technology Investment Roadmap". Hydrogen requires higher quality and therefore higher cost construction because the molecules are smaller and can escape a pipeline more easily. So if the plant is to run on hydrogen in the future, the pipeline and storage bottle will have to be replaced or there would be significant fugitive emissions.

The government's claim that this project "would contribute to the net reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the energy sector by providing ongoing firming of intermittent renewables" is out of touch with the rest of the world.

The New York Power Authority (NYPA) looks to [replace nearly a dozen, if not all, of its gas-fired peaker plants](#) with four hour battery storage installations.

The properties through which the pipeline travels will be devalued as some land will not be useable. Properties may become less productive and management practices will need to change.

[According to experts](#), this power plant and pipeline have a high risk of joining other stranded assets commissioned by government with taxpayers' money.

Ultimately the taxpayer will pay for the higher electricity prices this plant is destined to produce.