

Submission Snowy Hydro 2.0 EIS Main Works

As both an Australian citizen and Environmental Manager I wish to express my opposition in the strongest possible terms to the Snowy Hydro 2 Main Works. We cannot under any circumstances countenance destroying one third of the only remaining pristine unique World Heritage listed alpine region with an unsustainable development on such a vast scale that will have catastrophic impacts on this sensitive iconic region. Given a warming climate it is more imperative than ever to preserve this rare and fragile habitat.

As a flawed Project at in its initial conception this is a political exercise more than any genuine desire to replace existing fossil fuel generation, it cannot deliver the promised recyclable capacity 350 GWh with substantial deficits and net energy consumption resulting from limited reservoir capacities, pump energy and generator transmission losses.

The extent of site coverage (an estimated 250,000 ha) large scale vegetation clearing (permanently damaging 10,000ha) resulting spoil and dump waste material, groundworks disturbance through tunnelling, quarrying, road building and construction threatens rare and irreplaceable habitat, affects water table drawdown, will dry up existing creeks and impact the local fish and animals. Further the headwaters of our major waterways will be impacted as will inflows to the reservoirs and hence future water releases.

The works have the potential to disperse noxious aquatic and weed species throughout the rest of the Snowy Scheme and downstream rivers (Snowy, Murrumbidgee and Murray). Not only will the conservation aspects of the Park be severely damaged, but the aesthetics will be seriously diminished by invasive infrastructure in the form of roads, permanent large structures and especially transmission lines with the overall sense and experience of the Park landscape damaged forever.

The project is uneconomic with \$5.1 billion already awarded for a project that was anticipated to cost \$3.8 billion, with future estimates of cost to the taxpayer including transmission of \$10 billion.

Any perceived benefits are not commensurate with the costs, environmental, economic and stored or saved energy. This Project should NEVER proceed.

Sincerely

D Butt

Master Environmental Management, BA, Dip Ed