

My principle concern about this project is the obvious wanton desecration of the terrain and wildlife habitat in such a world renowned national park.

I believe the corridor below aerial wires is to be about 200 metres wide; a massive scar on the landscape forever, as it has to be cleared regularly, preventing any recovery and costing a lot of money.

There is also the visual impact of the towers and hanging wires for many kilometres.

There is no logical reason for this project of connecting wires from one place to another to be done in an aerial mode. It should be done by burying the wires in ducts underground.

The initial costs will be higher but the lower long term maintenance costs will outweigh those increased initial costs.

There is increased security of the line underground, with the prospect of climate changed weather patterns, almost certainly to bring more violent storms.

The transmission wires when buried underground will be safe from fires and snow storms, lessening maintenance and instability to the national grid.

This whole project of aerial versus underground is about money; the environment does not even rate a mention, with the NSW Government proposing to alter a long standing Park management clause banning any aerial wiring across the Park. The Australian Government can spend 90 billion dollars on submarines which will be obsolete or REDUNDANT when delivered, but will not spend money to save the Park.

Lastly and importantly, I quote you an example of leadership in preserving a National Park.

The Epping/Chatswood railway tunnel, built during Bob Carr's term as Premier, was originally designed to cross the Lane Cove river through Lane cove National Park via a long high level bridge, permanently desecrating a large section of the Park. Protests and petitions appealed to Carr and he listened and at greater expense buried the tunnel deeper and under the river.

**SOME THINGS ARE MORE VALUABLE THAN MONEY.**

There is an alternative route proposed by the National Parks Association and Dr Mc Girr that involves re-routing the Snowy 2.0 pumped hydro station to the lower Tumut switching station, rather than to the Maragle switching station. This alternative would have positive benefits for the separate Humelink transmission project,, which could be re-routed, reducing its impact on local communities and Bago State Forest.

I exhort you to reject this project and direct that it be a subterranean transmission link and allied to the Humelink Project.

Yours faithfully,

Albert Martin