

Benefits from this Modification proposal: False and/or misleading claims

On Page 8 of the EIS for Modification 4, we read:

The Flyers Creek Wind Farm, as modified by Modification 4 will provide the following primary benefits:

- In full operation, the Project would generate approximately 430 Gigawatt hours ("GWh) of electricity per year - sufficient for the average consumption of approximately 58,000 homes.

There is absolutely no correlation between the annual demand graph of 58,000 NSW homes and the annual supply graph of this wind farm, so the statement is misleading. But, on average, the wind farm will be able to power all lifts in high rise buildings, all life support systems in every NSW hospital and all our WiFi routers.

- It would assist in replacing the 1,000 megawatt ("MW) shortfall identified by the Australian Energy Market Operator as being required to supplement the lost generation capacity which will result from the planned closure of the Liddell Power Station in 2022.

Electricity produced by wind energy can never replace base load produced by Liddell. That statement is false.

- It would contribute to the State and Federal Governments' target of providing 33,000 GWh from renewable sources by 2020.

There is no construction timeframe offered in this EIS. Note, the DGRs were issued for the wind farm in January 2009. All delays since then are Infigen's. There is no guarantee that construction will be started by 2020, let alone contributing to the Federal RET by being operational.

Also, the state has no such target. That statement is false.

- It would contribute to the NSW Government's target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 60% by the year 2050.

NSW has no such target, nor any greenhouse gas reduction target at all. From Page 1 of the NSW Climate Change Policy Framework, NSW has an aspirational long-term objective to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. Note how Infigen changes 50 to 60, aspirational objective to target and deletes the key word "Net"

That statement is false.

- It will contribute to inter-generational equity by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reducing consumption of finite fossil fuel resources.

Who knows? The author is getting desperate for benefits. It is hard to equate the need to reduce consumption of finite fossil fuel resources while coal exports are our biggest money earner. As for inter-generational equity, many Australians can't think further than their next electricity bill, the size of which is entirely due to the contribution of wind farms to intra-generational inequity

- It will provide full time employment for a peak of 140 people during construction and up to 6 to 10 ongoing regional jobs during its operational life.

What does “up to 6 to 10” mean? Seeing they advise above that this wind farm is assisting in replacing the loss of the Liddell power station, how many lost jobs at Liddell is it replacing?

- It will result in a direct injection of approximately \$1 million per annum to the local community through payments to landholders, permanent staff and community fund contributions.

If we assume, as claimed above, that 10 ongoing regional jobs will be created, not much will be left for the hosts, other landholders and the community fund. The statement misleads because it doesn't consider the corresponding economic dis-benefits.

In particular, Modification 4 will:

- enable these important benefits to be realised by reinstating the 132 kv transmission line so as to connect the Project to the electricity grid.

It is true that any benefits will only be realized through a connection to the grid. However, grid connection is not needed for the ongoing dis-benefits such as property devaluation and community discord. They are happening now.

- increase the total generation capacity of the Project by between 15 to 20% compared to the currently approved Project through the use of more efficient turbine technology than was available when the Project was originally approved.

Is there a benefit in producing 20% more electricity, when the original wind farm output was not required to meet NSW demand?

If these are the primary benefits of this wind farm, as modified, spare us the secondary benefits.

In previous Assessments, the Department of Planning has parroted these benefits in support. This time let the Department of Planning tell us the real benefits and dis-benefits, of this modification and indeed this wind farm, otherwise, reject this modification.