

On behalf of my company, Greyseal Holdings Pty Limited, I wish to lodge my objection to AGL's proposed extension of time for the commencement of work on the proposed gas fired power plant project: Dalton Power Project MOD 1, approved by the PAC under Part 3A of the Environmental Assessment and Planning Act 1979, since repealed.

I am opposed to an extension of time for the following reasons:

I have lived in Dalton for over 20 years and own a small business here. I have previously worked for a power company and have a reasonable understanding of how they work and how wholesale electricity pricing mechanisms work.

In my business, I employ five local people. If the proposed plant were to be realised, there is a potential for Dalton to simply atrophy. My business would likely close and these five people, through no fault of their own, would find themselves unemployed. Where is the fairness in that, when AGL stand to make billions. If this is about money, where is their share?

Dalton is predominantly a farming community, with a number of local people opting for organic or bio-dynamic farming. The proposed turbines will likely cause pollution in the forms of noise, vibration, toxic gases spewing into the atmosphere, potentially falling on these farms, into our waterways and causing health impacts on local Dalton residents, as well as these farmers and their employees. There have been endangered species identified in the last five years, with the recent finding of the southern pigmy perch and the yellow spotted southern bell frog in our waterways. The frog was thought gone for thirty years. A power plant will surely threaten these two endangered species.

The issue of air quality is another area where AGL have completely misled us. Far from using relevant, local data, they opt for data collected from Goulburn Airport – 60km away, not an insignificant distance given the wildly varying climatic conditions. On any given day, there could be at least a 3 – 6 degree difference in temperature, let alone anything else. Frequently, cloudy or fog-bound Goulburn sees fine and clear weather in Dalton. The reverse is also true. The air monitoring installation, at the Dalton Public School, until recently was non-operational. AGL claims to have air quality data for the past five years. If the unit was not operating, where did they get the data?

AGL contend the turbines to be used are within specifications. Despite concerted efforts to discover the specifications, they remain a mystery. There does not appear to be any available information, but AGL still claim they are within spec. If they are, why won't AGL disclose this information? Could this be another lie or half-truth from AGL?

AGL claim the facility is a 'peaking' plant, and not for base load generation. They claim that it will only operate for approximately 15% of the time and that might likely only be 5%. What is the penalty if the plant does operate in excess of 15% of the time and who pays the fine? What guarantee do we have that it will, in fact, only be a 'peaking' plant? With the closure of so many coal fired plants, estimated at around 6,000MW, where is the base load to be generated? It seems obvious this is the most likely generation point for NSW. AGL have again failed to answer these questions.

I understand the Santos gas pipeline from the Moomba gas field is to be decommissioned. How does AGL plan to source gas from this pipeline? They don't. They plan to deliver truckloads of liquid natural gas (LNG) into a huge storage facility to

fire the turbines. This will cause more noise and dust pollution, further exacerbating our living conditions.

The so-called Traffic Management Plan is a farce. The sheer size and weight of the proposed turbines means there will need to be major roadworks in Gunning, at least at the rail crossing, and the corridor between Gunning and Dalton will require major restructuring, demanding the removal of most of the trees along the current road, a new road surface, possibly doubling the width and requiring upgraded strengthening. The turbines proposed are around 900 tonnes. In the initial installation they require three. These turbines are around 100 metres long. An installation, in France, saw a similar turbine on the back of a low loader being pulled by three trucks and being pushed by a fourth. Effectively, the Dalton Road will have to be remade since there is nowhere for these trucks to adequately manoeuvre, and its current load capacity would not see the road surface last. In addition, provision needs to be made for the hundreds of construction trucks that will potentially use the road.

It is estimated there has been in excess of \$20 million of investment in the purchase of properties, houses, land and developments in the five years since this project was announced. It appears that all this investment has been completed without the purchaser's knowledge of the proposed facility. One of these purchasers is a real estate agent. How absurd is it to conceive that he would deliberately purchase any property, knowing full well that it could be worth less than the original purchase price. That would not be very astute of him. He has since put this development on hold and several other purchasers have completely shelved projects because of the uncertainty. Still, AGL contends everyone knew. So much for transparency.

Further, the Canberra – Murrumbateman corridor is becoming too expensive for the average property purchaser and Dalton is the next place for growth. This growth is unlikely to occur if the plant is built. Other reasons for people opting to live in Dalton include our clean air, pristine night sky, relaxed country lifestyle, ease of access to Yass, Goulburn and Canberra and our friendly community. If the plant proceeds, all this will be nothing but a pipe dream.

Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation (BNAC) was invited to provide an onsite inspection under the Construction Heritage Management Plan, specifically in relation to Cultural Heritage. The Assessment report failed to meet the requirement for Aboriginal consultation because there was no Aboriginal representative made available on the day. It, therefore, could not meet the requirement for effective consultation with Aboriginal people as a fundamental component of the assessment process. BNAC reluctantly agreed with the proposed recommendations, primarily for the protection of their culture and provided additional recommendations to assist in the provision of that protection. If AGL are truly seeking consultation with all sections of the community, surely one with the Indigenous people would be paramount. However, since there was no one available, on the day, it appears that AGL took that as tacit agreement and rubber stamped the project, on their behalf. Where is the democracy there?

AGL claims to be a good neighbour. In the five years since AGL purchased the land for the plant, AGL has shown complete disregard for its obligation to care for the land it owns. AGL has failed to control noxious weeds on its lands. The invasion of native plant communities by exotic weeds threatens our native plants and animals and it threatens the livelihoods of our farmers - AGL's neighbours.

AGL contend that “the additional time will enable AGL to recommence engagement with the local community”. Further, “recommencement of community and stakeholder engagement will provide maximum transparency for the local community”. That routine use of Community Consultation Committees during development and construction will ensure effective communication. It is apparent that, there having been no consultation in the past five years, so called re-engagement to provide maximum transparency is nothing more than rhetoric. How can something that has never commenced be recommenced?

I find it an affront that, as part of my application, I am asked to disclose whether I have made any political donations. This is particularly offensive as AGL has been found guilty on many occasions, in South Australia both State and Federal for failure to disclose and was fined \$124,000 for non-disclosure for several projects including this one. More importantly, they hid this information and when it was discovered, their response was that it was an oversight. And here we have another reason not to trust what AGL says in relation to this project.

AGL seeks to deceive us by attempting to get this extension approved so it can construct their plant under the spectre of corruption of the repealed Part 3A legislation.

If this plant is to be everything AGL claims, why won't they answer our questions – truthfully, honestly and completely?

On behalf of my employees, the citizens of Dalton, Gunning and the surrounding areas, and other business owners in Dalton, I earnestly request you make serious and considered decisions on the future of this facility and request you deny AGL's request for an extension of time.

Rob Lee Tet
Director
Greyseal Holdings Pty Limited.