



PO Box 2
Coolah NSW 2843

The Uarbry Tongy Lane Alliance Inc objects to Glanmire Solar (SSD 21208499)

The Elgin project to put solar panels on agricultural cropping land and in local communities where the population oppose the development is clearly environmentally destructive and unacceptable.

The Elgin EIS is littered with inconsistencies, mistakes, and omissions. A sloppiness that we have come to expect from developers of renewable energy projects. This is never called out by DPE despite continual evidence provided by community volunteers who trawl the thousands of pages of EIS documents, attend numerous meetings and spend hours on research. Meanwhile the developer submits a template EIS with poor attention to detail and scant interest in the irreversible environmental and food security impacts.

Most solar panels and their manufactured components come from China, often made by forced labour from ethnic minorities, in addition the silica is increasingly mined from pristine beaches along Cape York. There is currently no method of recycling solar panels in Australia – where is the proposed land fill site for the obsolete solar panels? Where will Elgin be when the site needs to be rehabilitated? What infrastructure is left buried in this agricultural land forever? What has leached from the panels into the soil during the degradation of the panels over their lifespan?

The Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) adds significantly to the fire risks and environmental cost of the project. There are currently no regulations or safety protocols for dealing with thermal runaway. Yet BESS are proposed for bush fire prone areas. This project provides no details on the fire suppressant systems that could prevent an environmental disaster from fire and the subsequent thermal runaway. Are we waiting for a disaster before implementing any regulations? What about the environmental cost of the additional land clearing around BESS? And the water supply required to put out a fire in BESS?

If this project is approved will Elgin and DPE take responsibility for the potential loss of human life and property plus the certain environmental disaster in a thermal runaway event?

Elgin state the project will provide energy for approximately 28,000 homes per annum. This is a very nonspecific statement. Please detail how many hours of typical energy demand for these 28,000 homes and whether the energy will be available during peak times. If the project will displace approximately 130,000 metric tonnes of CO2 per annum, please provide specific calculation details. Is this CO2 displaced to the country that manufactures the panels and the countries that mined the materials to provide the components? Are the transport costs of raw material and finished panels and batteries accounted for? Are the costs of building the transmission corridors included? Elgin and DPE are asking the community to consider the costs and the benefits of this project so surely the community is entitled to be supplied with all the facts.

Has Elgin explained to all neighbouring landowners the impending insurance costs they will incur? The standard public liability policy will not cover a \$152 million project. Many insurers will not provide public liability cover to businesses beside solar/battery plants. Has Elgin explained to all neighbouring landowners that restrictions will likely be place on their operations given the risk those operations may pose for the Elgin solar project, for example crop harvesting.

This development is not in the public interest and is environmentally and agriculturally destructive. The only winner here is Elgin, whose whole focus is profit maximization no matter the environmental or food security cost.

Kathryn Reynolds

On behalf of Tongy Lane Alliance Inc