



**Parramatta Climate Action Network**  
**15 Cliff Ave, Winston Hills <http://parracan.org/>**

**Submission on the Clyde Terminal SSD 5147**

At our last meeting ParraCAN decided that we would oppose the continued use of the Clyde terminal. We feel that the storage of volatile petrol and other fuels such as avgas should not be stored there. A much more sensible decision would be to transfer the facility to Kurnell or Port Botany. The ships could then go straight to the storage facility and the fuel could be stored there until it would be taken to the rest of NSW by tankers. A pipe (that I believe already exists) could be used to take avgas and any other fuel needed by the airlines, to the airport. A shorter pipeline will be much cheaper to insure. Fuel from Singapore or other countries could also be taken to Newcastle (Hamilton) for storage and distribution to the northern parts of NSW.

Some reasons for this decision are:

- a) The wetland on the Duck River contains endangered species and it isn't worth putting them at risk from an accidental spill.
- b) Ships coming up the harbour to Gore Bay would put the harbour foreshores, all the islands in the harbour and the delicate harbour ecosystems that are just recovering from all the runoff over more than a hundred years, at risk if an accident happened while a ship was in the harbour and could also be dangerous to houses and parks along the harbour shores
- c) A damaged harbour is detrimental to tourism.
- d) Tanker trucks wouldn't have to travel through Western Sydney as much. Western Sydney gets an inversion layer where local pollution and pollution from further east blows west and settles over the area for extended periods of time. This doesn't occur in southern suburbs around Kurnell. Also because many tankers would go direct to Newcastle the total volume of trucks to Sydney (whether Clyde or Kurnell) would be considerably less.
- e) We support better public transport and fewer cars on the road so Kurnell and Hamilton will be able to cope with fewer tankers as less fuel will be required.
- f) Not only will there be fewer cars but there will be more hybrid cars and electric cars so this will result in less fuel needed.

Before we could properly consider this proposal we would want to see a complete carbon emissions analysis of the current proposal including for works, operation and tanker transportation from terminal to point of sale compared to a similar analysis for our alternative proposals of all operations being from Hamilton and Kurnell. We would think this essential given the clear signs that we are now in a critical decade for taking significant action to reduce carbon emissions in order to avert dangerous climate change.

If Shell doesn't support our above suggestions then we believe that the SSD 5147 should not be considered now but should be considered with the Gore Bay SSD 5148 at a later date, possibly in

February. This is a very complex issue and would appreciate someone from the Department of Planning to come to a meeting to speak to us about it. We would then be pleased to do another submission if we change our minds.