Roger Heap
PO Box 125
Rylstone NSW 2849
r.heap@skymesh.com.au

# Bowdens Environmental Impact Statement Submission

Dear Sir,

I wish to make a submission to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Bowdens Silver Project.

My concern in this project is in relation to the Electrical Supply options which, depending on which one is chosen, could have a profound effect on my life. The supply options are not dealt with specifically in the main document, but are discussed in Appendix 9, "Bowdens Silver Project-Electrical Options," by the JLE Group.

My name is Roger Heap and I live at 3541 Bylong Valley Way, Breakfast Ck, through which Endeavour Energy's 66kV Bylong feeder passes. This line is proposed to be utilized for the "Breakfast Creek Option" in JLE's report. I am an Electronics Technician and have worked locally for Telstra as a Senior Technical Officer and for Australian Cement at the Kandos Plant as the Control Systems Technician, till the plant closed in 2011. I am a current associate member of Engineers Australia. I arrived in the area in 1984 to work for, the then, Telecom and have lived at the Bylong Valley Way address since 1989.

My objection to the Breakfast Creek option arises from the probable need to upgrade the line through my property, requiring the enlargement of the easement. My house is situated adjacent to the line, and any enlargement of the easement would likely bring the lines closer and effect my ability to enjoy my property and subject me to greater EMF levels with its associated health effects. Significant environmental impact is also likely to result from the necessary clearing of trees. I am one of the many land holders whose property would be affected in this way, many would also be affected by the need for new easements to be established, particularly in the Pyangle area.

The report states the need to augment to a higher rating the existing 66kV conductors of the 839 Bylong feeder through my property, this was to be the option for the Kepco Coal mine at Bylong. Access negotiations with land holders, including myself, had started with WorleyParsons Ltd, acting for Kepco, to upgrade the conductors when the Bylong Coal Project approval was not granted by your department. The Bylong Project is presently undergoing appeal and is marked under "Company coal exploration or mining titles" on the map "Areas in NSW coal regions available and excluded from future coal exploration and mining," dated June 2020, produced by the NSW Government, it has therefore not been excluded and may proceed. Were both the Bowdens and the Bylong projects to access this line , it is very likely that it's capacity would be exceeded and a second line would need to be installed, requiring the enlargement of the easement through my property. It is quite likely that the Bowdens project with its high load, and the increasing domestic load of the Bylong area alone, would need the line to be duplicated in the near future.

It is worth noting that the Bylong project identified that the existing timber poles need to be replaced to accommodate the heaver conductors. This means that the stated augmentation is, in effect, a total replacement of the line from Kandos. The demolition and rebuilding of the line will

cause major disruption to the power supply of those of us on the route as it requires the domestic load, provided by a SWER line collocated on the 66kV poles, to be serviced by generators at each premises .

The EIS report mentions a further option from Transgrid's Wollar 330kV substation at Wollar, which was identified post Transgrid's Formal Connection Enquiry. I consider the exclusion of this option from consideration to be a defect in Bowdens EIS. This substation presently services the coal mines at Wilpinjong and Moolarbin. Its 330kV is of higher capacity than the Ilford 132kV substation and is one the closest options. The established easement for the large 500kV Mt Piper to Bayswater line passes adjacent to the Bowden's site, it adjoins the Wollar substation and it passes through a largely unpopulated area. Connection from Wollar to Bowens by dedicated 66kV or 132kV feeders via this easement would surely be a cheap option and would inconvenience very few landowners with little environmental impact .

I would like to comment on the other power proposals. I refer to JLE's map, "Figure A Electrical Supply Options." In terms of Environmental impact, the Queen's Pinch option runs through a largely forested area. The establishment of the large sized easement for a 132kV line through the marked route would cause significant environmental damage. The two proposals for a 132kV line from Mudgee both pass through many properties. Even if these routes use existing easements, the enlargement of them to the 132kV standard will likely cause many objections, of the nature of my submission. The remaining two options, 132kV from Ilford or Aarons Pass, pass through less properties before joining the existing 500kV easement but still may precipitate objections from the effected landowners, due to the need to establish new easements.

I have included an attachment from Endeavour Energy's" TRANSMISSION NETWORK PLANNING REVIEW 2017 - 2026", titled "16 Ilford Transmission Substation". It states load application NIL0212 for the Bowdens project, connecting to the Ilford substation busbar. This would imply the Ilford option, via the Bayswater 500kV easement. This option does not affect my property, and would raise no objection from me but, if this option has progressed beyond the scope of the JLE report, it would indicate out of date information has been used within the EIS. This raises the question, how many other sections of the EIS are defective.

In closing, I wish to voice my objection to the Breakfast Creek option for powering the Bowdens Silver Project.

I thank you for considering my submission to the EIS for the Bowens Silver Project, and hope that you see that the powering of this project can have a significant effect on landowners and the environment, both surrounding and distant to the mine site.

Yours Sincerely
Roger K Heap