



ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY TABLE

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
Government stakeholders			
DPHI Energy Resources & Industry Assessment team	Urbis Planning and the Applicant held a meeting with DPHI on 4 March 2024. The meeting was held to provide an update to DPHI on the status of the preparation of the EIS, an update on the design of the project, and discuss the approach for biodiversity assessment.	DPHI provided the following feedback: - Acknowledged the targeted timing for submission of the EIS and that further updates are welcome. - Acknowledged the approach of the design for the project and that the Applicant is continuing consultation with Transgrid to identify the preferred alignment for connection to the existing substation. - Confirmed that a BDAR is required.	- The Applicant has continued consultation with Transgrid and finalised the alignment of the proposed connection to the existing substation. This is detailed in the Development Plans submitted as part of the EIS. - A detailed BDAR has been prepared in accordance with the SEARs, submitted as part of the EIS.
DCCEEW Environment and Heritage Team	Urbis and WaterTech met with DCCEEW to discuss whether a BDAR waiver could be granted based on minimal ecological impacts.	DCCEEW requested the BDAR to be undertaken, in agreeance with DPHI.	A BDAR has been prepared in accordance with the SEARs and following the appropriate module for the extent of the impacts. DCCEEW will have the opportunity to provide

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
			further feedback during the exhibition period.
Edward River Council			
Development Services and Major Projects Branch	Urbis Planning held a meeting with Council's Development Services and Major Projects Branches, as well as members of the GDA project team, on 21 February 2024. This meeting was held to provide information about the proposal and collect feedback, as well as provide an opportunity for Council to ask questions from the project team.	Council provided the following feedback: ▪ Necessity to investigate any potential flooding impacts. ▪ Council advised community views, including that: – Solar farm was refused last year on visual impact grounds – The community does not have consultation fatigue but has expressed views against solar infrastructure. ▪ Council asked if there is consideration of any planning agreement. ▪ Council asked about waste generation, advising that Council does not want to accept waste in landfill. ▪ Council asked whether TfNSW has been consulted.	▪ A detailed assessment of the likely impacts of the proposal, including flooding, on surrounding watercourses and groundwater resources, has been included as part of the EIS. Further details can be found in the Flood Risk and Impact Assessment. ▪ The proposal does not involve solar infrastructure. The design of the proposal has incorporated landscaping to build upon existing screening and mitigate any potential visual impacts. Further details can be found in the Visual Impact Assessment and Landscape Plan, both submitted as part of the EIS. ▪ The proposal is not expected to generate any long-term community needs. Further details in relation to community needs are included in the Social

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
			Impact Assessment, submitted as part of the EIS. - Should the proposal be approved, GDA will manage disposal of waste and decommissioning at the end of the project lifecycle. - TfNSW provided comment for SEARs and have been consulted to inform the Transport Impact Assessment. Further details of consultation with TfNSW can be found below in this report, as well as the Transport Impact Assessment.
Economic Development Branch	Urbis Community Planning held a meeting with Council's Economic Development Branch on 29 May 2024. This meeting was held to gather insights about potential positive or negative impacts of the proposal to inform the SIA.	Council provided the following feedback in relation to the potential positive or negative impacts of the proposal. Social and site context Council advised that solar proposals and projects located close to the town have received some negative community sentiment due to concerns about repurposing productive agricultural land for renewable development.	Social and site context The proposal does not involve solar infrastructure. The proposal site has not been used as productive agricultural land for the past 25 years and has no future planned agricultural use. The Deniliquin Local Aboriginal Land Council was engaged during the preparation of the SSDA. Further details can be found below in this report, as well as the Aboriginal and

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
		Council also suggested the Deniliquin Local Aboriginal Land Council as an important contact for engagement in relation to the proposal.	Cultural Heritage Report, submitted as part of the EIS.
		Workforce and housing ▪ Council recognised opportunities to advertise local construction jobs should the proposal be approved, however, noted a limited supply of workers in the area. ▪ Council suggested construction be shared across contractors within Deniliquin as well as surrounding nearby towns, to ensure the proposal does not take all the local construction capacity. ▪ Council suggested coordinating construction times with peak tourism travel times to ensure that peak construction overlaps with low tourist season to provide an influx of money for local hotel and motel operators. For example, don't have peak construction times during Easter	Workforce and housing ▪ An assessment of workforce and housing considerations has been considered as part of the Social Impact Assessment (SIA). ▪ Should the proposal be approved, local construction jobs will be advertised in Deniliquin as well as surrounding nearby towns. ▪ Construction will be coordinated with peak tourism periods per Council suggestions.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
		or the Deni Ute Festival in October. ▪ Council did not oppose temporary workforce accommodation but requested details of repurposing after the construction period. ▪ Council also suggested nearby towns should also be considered in the workforce housing strategy.	
		Potential positive social and economic impacts and community benefits Council noted opportunities for positive social and economic impacts, including: ▪ Employment and education opportunities for local construction workers and young people seeking apprenticeships and upskilling opportunities ▪ Opportunities to give back to the community, such as rebate on energy to support local households ▪ Opportunities to provide financial support/funding to support local	Potential positive social and economic impacts and community benefits GDA has used Council's suggestions to inform the proposal. Should the proposal be approved, GDA will work with Council under a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) to deliver community benefits. The Applicant has also commenced discussions with local businesses to maximise local employment during construction and operation. Landscape planting is proposed along the frontages of the proposed development to provide visual screening.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
		infrastructure, services and events. Council also provided suggestions to enhance potential positive social and economic impacts, and prevent or minimise potential negative impacts, including: ▪ Education around renewable developments in the community ▪ A suggestion that trees should be provided to screen views from the street. In relation to the Voluntary Planning Agreement which GDA will work with Council to delivery, Council suggested that: ▪ Beneficiaries could include local Aboriginal groups, neighbours and/or infrastructure located close to the site, and Council's Community Benefits Fund ▪ Infrastructure support could include supporting Council to upgrade the train line to be support intermodal transport, including containers to support transport of construction materials	

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
		Supporting local arts, cultural and sporting bodies.	
Elected officials	Urbis Engagement emailed Council's elected officials on 7 May 2024. This email provided information about the proposal along with the community newsletter, details for how to provide feedback, and an invitation to an individual online briefing. Deputy Mayor Marc Petersen and Councillor Shirlee Burge both attended the community pop-up session on Friday 17 May.	At the community pop-up session on Friday 17 May, Deputy Mayor Marc Petersen and Councillor Shirlee Burge provided the following feedback about the proposal: Flooding Deputy Mayor Marc Petersen noted that existing flood models are out of date and that flooding is a risk across the whole area. During the last flood, the substation was protected through sufficient levees.	Flooding Hydrologists Water Technology Pty Ltd (WaterTech) have used flood mapping from Edward River LGA, dated 2014, to inform their assessment of flood risk associated with the proposal. Flood risk associated with the proposal has been assessed as having little to no potential impacts on Deniliquin. Further details can be found in the Hydrology Report Assessment.
		Reliable power supply Major power outage recently in town – interested in whether the proposal will contribute to more reliable power.	Reliable power supply BESS technology contributes to network stability by providing fast and reliable response times to prevent blackouts and other disruptions, ensuring a more reliable and secure power supply.
		Fire safety Recommended putting up a shed on site with a fire truck for public perception of fire safety.	Fire safety The proposal includes an on-site 20,000L firefighting water tank as

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
			part of the fire safety measures of the proposal. Whilst the proposal does not include a new shed on-site with a fire truck, the Deniliquin Fire Station has been informed of the proposal through the engagement period, and GDA will continue to inform the Deniliquin Fire Station as plans progress.
		Local employment opportunities Enquired if local construction companies will be engaged, noting this would be a benefit. There are two local companies who they recommend.	Local employment opportunities Should the proposal be approved, local construction jobs will be advertised in Deniliquin as well as surrounding nearby towns.
		Further engagement with Council's elected officials Recommended briefing Council on the first Tuesday in June – work through CEO's office to confirm attendance.	Further engagement with Council's elected officials Council's elected officials were individually emailed on 7 May 2024. This email provided information about the proposal along with the community newsletter, details for how to provide feedback, and an invitation to an individual online briefing. To date, no responses have been received from Council's elected officials.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
State and Federal MPs			
State MP: Helen Dalton – Member for Murray	Urbis Engagement emailed Helen Dalton – State Member for Murray on 7 May 2024. This email provided information about the proposal along with the community newsletter, details for how to provide feedback, and an invitation to an individual online briefing.	To date, no response has been received from Helen Dalton – State Member for Murray.	GDA will continue to inform the State Member for Murray as plans progress.
Federal MP: Sussan Ley – Member for Farrer	Urbis Engagement emailed Sussan Ley – Federal Member for Farrer on 7 May 2024. This email provided information about the proposal along with the community newsletter, details for how to provide feedback, and an invitation to an individual online briefing.	To date, no response has been received from Sussan Ley – Federal Member for Farrer.	GDA will continue to inform the Federal Member for Farrer as plans progress.
Relevant agencies			
TfNSW	Urbis Transport Advisory emailed TfNSW on 7 June 2024. This email provided information about the proposal including an indicative base plan, and requested a meeting with TfNSW to understand any assessment	To date, no response has been received from TfNSW.	Urbis Transport Advisory and GDA will continue to inform TfNSW as plans progress.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
	requirements beyond that listed in the SEARs.		
Murray Irrigation Limited (Murray Irrigation)	Urbis Planning held an online meeting with Murray Irrigation and members of the GDA project team on 15 March 2024. This meeting was held to provide information about the proposal and collect feedback in relation to the irrigation channel, as well as provide an opportunity for Murray Irrigation to ask questions from the project team.	▪ Murray Irrigation expressed a preference for base plan option one as this would provide better maintenance access and requested that access be provided in accordance with their design policy. ▪ Murray Irrigation has no standards or specified criteria in relation to bridges over irrigation channels, however noted a preference for an over-spanning (arching) bridge on both banks. ▪ Murray Irrigation enquired about ownership of the bridges. ▪ Murray Irrigation requested that the bridge design allows for a small excavator for maintenance of the middle bank, or for GDA to concrete the top of the central bank between the two bridges so that Murray Irrigation does not require maintenance access.	▪ The proposal design provides access in accordance with Murray Irrigation's design policy. ▪ Following GDA's advice, Gransolar will only include one bridge to reduce the number of assets over the channels and that several water quality mitigation and monitoring measures will be in place to prevent any impacts on the Canal. Once the project reaches the end of its lifecycle and it's decommissioned the bridge could be dedicated to Murray Irrigation.'
Fire and Rescue NSW – Deniliquin Fire Station	Urbis Engagement emailed Deniliquin Fire Station on 7 May 2024.	To date, no response has been received from Deniliquin Fire Station.	GDA will continue to inform Deniliquin Fire Station as plans progress.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
	This email provided information about the proposal along with the community newsletter, details for how to provide feedback, and an invitation to an individual online briefing.		
Aboriginal stakeholders			
Deniliquin Local Aboriginal Land Council (DLALC)	As part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) for the project, Urbis Heritage consulted the DLALC as required to determine the cultural significance of objects and/or places on and surrounding the site. A range of contact methods were used including email and phone. The Stage 1.2 Agency Notice was sent to DLALC on 8 March 2024. The Stage 1.3 Registered Aboriginal Party Invitation was sent to DLALC on 13 March 2024. The Stage 1.6 Notification was sent to DLALC on 8 April 2024. The Stage 2 and 3 Information Package was sent to DLALC on 9 April 2024. DLALC was contacted by phone on 16 April 2024 to discuss the	No response was received from DLALC with regards to the Stage 1.2 Agency Notice, Stage 1.3 RAP Invitation or Stage 1.6 Notification. DLALC expressed agreement with the preliminary findings of the ACHA.	Further details about engagement with the DLALC is provided in the ACHAR, submitted as part of the EIS. GDA used the ACHAR to inform the proposal's approach to, and understanding of, the potential impacts affecting this community. GDA and Urbis Heritage will continue to engage and provide project updates to the DLALC, in addition to providing the opportunity for DLALC to provide comment or feedback.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment and Field Survey Methodology. The Stage 3 Field Survey was then undertaken with DLALC on 22 May 2024.		
Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs)	As part of the ACHAR, Urbis Heritage consulted the RAPs as required to determine the cultural significance of objects and/or places on and surrounding the site. A total of 6 Aboriginal parties registered interest in the project. A range of contact types were used including email, postal letters & phone. A search of the National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT) registers and databases was undertaken on 28 February 2024 and no pending Native Title claims or Native Title registrations were identified. The NNTT was also contacted by email on 28 February 2024 to request a formal search of the NNTT Register. The Stage 1.3 RAP Invitation was sent to all RAPs on 18 March 2024.	A reply was received on 28 February 2024 indicating that although there is one Native Title claim (VC2021/001) which intersects with the subject area, this claim was not accepted for registration. The consultation process identified that the subject area has social and cultural value for the Aboriginal community due to its connection to the broader landscape around the subject area, particularly around waterways. However, due to the site's highly disturbed condition, the social and cultural value of the site has diminished and has been assessed as low.	Further details about the engagement process and feedback from the RAPs is provided in the ACHAR, submitted as part of the EIS. GDA used the ACHAR to inform the proposal's approach to, and understanding of, the potential impacts affecting this community. GDA and Urbis Heritage will continue to engage and provide project updates to the RAPs, in addition to providing the opportunity for the RAPs to provide comment or feedback.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
	The Stage 2 and 3 Information Pack was sent to all RAPs on 9 April 2024. The Stage 2 3 Site Inspection was undertaken with Yarkuwa Indigenous Knowledge Centre on 22 May 2024.		
Community			
Current site landowner	Urbis Engagement held a phone meeting with the current site landowner on 19 March 2024. The meeting was held to develop an understanding of local context and consult the current site landowner in relation to the upcoming engagement program and gather feedback on the approach to engagement in the Deniliquin community. Urbis Engagement emailed a community newsletter to the current site landowner on 7 May 2024. The newsletter provided information about the proposal, and invited feedback via the SIA survey, 1800 number or enquiry email. A copy of the newsletter is included in Appendix A of this report.	The current site landowner generally endorsed the engagement program. The current site landowner suggested that the Deniliquin Pastoral Times newspaper would be the best method of informing the community of the proposal and providing details of upcoming opportunities to provide feedback. The current site landowner responded to the LUCRA email on 19 May 2024. In this email, they advised that their land has been largely unused for the past 25 years, other than being used for grazing during years of high rainfall. It was also advised that there are no current changes to planned use of the land in the future.	Urbis Engagement published a newspaper advertisement in the Deniliquin Pastoral Times on: ▪ Friday 10 May ▪ Tuesday 14 May. The advertisement included details about the proposal and how to provide feedback, as well as an invitation to the community to attend upcoming information sessions. A copy of the newspaper advertisement is included in Appendix D of this report. The current site landowner's response to the LUCRA email has been included in the LUCRA, submitted as part of the EIS.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
	Urbis Engagement also sent a LUCRA email the current site landowner on 15 May 2024. This email outlined the purpose of the LUCRA and asked a series of questions regarding past, present and planned future land use for properties neighbouring the proposal site.		
Neighbouring dwellings (within 1.5km of the site) on: - Aratula South Road - Aratula North Road - Riverina Highway - Hogans Lane.	Urbis Engagement emailed a community newsletter to neighbouring dwellings on 7 May 2024. The newsletter provided information about the proposal, and invited feedback via the SIA survey, 1800 number or enquiry email. A copy of the newsletter is included in Appendix A of this report. Urbis Engagement also sent a LUCRA email to neighbouring dwellings on 15 May 2024. This email outlined the purpose of the LUCRA and asked a series of questions regarding past, present and planned future land use for	Residents from neighbouring dwellings provided feedback at the community information pop-up sessions. Below are details of feedback provided. Support for the proposal Some residents expressed support for the proposal, due to: - Its location near the Deniliquin substation - It's contribution to the renewable energy transition, "If we want to have renewable energy, we've got to have batteries".	Support for the proposal Noted.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
	properties neighbouring the proposal site. Urbis Engagement hosted two community information pop-up sessions on 17 and 18 May 2024. Members of the GDA project team and Urbis' Engagement and Community Planning teams attended the pop-up sessions. A copy of the display materials used at these sessions is included in Appendix B of this report.	Hazards and safety Some residents expressed interest in the mitigation of risks of contamination of the irrigation channel, and concerns around potential health impacts of the proposal.	Hazards and safety The EIS includes a Preliminary Hazard Assessment (PHA) which has assessed risks of hazardous materials associated with the proposal. The proposal does not pose any risk of contamination to the irrigation channel, nor any human health impacts.
		Concerns around impacts to private property and business operations One resident expressed concerns about potential impacts including: ▪ Property devaluation ▪ Impacts on beekeeping business and farming practices ▪ Proximity of commercial power poles increasing costs for private power connection and preventing future building plans for a new dwelling in desired location ▪ View loss across the paddock.	Concerns around impacts to private property and business operations ▪ A Social and Economic Impact Assessment has been prepared as part of the EIS. The assessment did not find evidence to suggest any negative impacts to property value in proximity of the proposal. ▪ The proposal will not impact business practices located on adjoining properties. ▪ Should the proposal be approved, GDA is committed to working with neighbouring dwellings to mitigate any potential impacts associated

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
			with private access to power connection. ▪ The proposal design has incorporated extra vegetative buffer to mitigate visual impacts for neighbouring dwellings.
		Interest in community benefits Suggestions provided by a resident for potential community benefits through the VPA included: ▪ Sponsorship of the Picola League and/or Murray League sporting clubs ▪ Upgrade of the Deniliquin Rams football club grandstand ▪ Upgrade of the Deniliquin Rovers netball club facilities ▪ Sponsorship of awards for Deniliquin Business Chambers local business awards ▪ Sponsorship of annual Deni Utes festival in October.	Interest in community benefits Should the proposal be approved, GDA will work with Council under a VPA to deliver community benefits. The VPA will be informed by suggestions from the community and from Council.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
		Enquiries One resident enquired about the approval process.	Enquiries GDA is seeking approval from the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure through the State Significant Development Application process.
Wider Deniliquin community	From 7 May 2024, detailed project information has been available on the project website (https://deniliquinbess.com.au/) The website was advertised via the newsletter, the newspaper advertisement, and on information boards displayed at the community information pop-up sessions. A copy of the website content is included in Appendix C of this report. Urbis Engagement published a newspaper advertisement in the Deniliquin Pastoral Times on: ▪ Friday 10 May ▪ Tuesday 14 May. The advertisement included details about the proposal and how to provide feedback, as well as an invitation to the community to attend upcoming information sessions. A copy of the newspaper	Support for the proposal Community members expressed support for the proposal due to its contribution to a more sustainable energy supply, including positive sentiment with regards to BESS technology: “It is great that it stores energy in off-peak and releases it during peak demand periods”. Community members also expressed support for the proposal given its low risk of potential impacts.	Support for the proposal Noted.
		Hazards and safety Community members were interested in the hazards and safety assessments included in the proposal, in particular: ▪ Fire safety measures ▪ Radiation risks.	Hazards and safety The EIS includes a Bushfire Assessment Report which provides details of the proposal’s fire safety measures. The EIS also includes a Preliminary Hazard Assessment (PHA) which has assessed risks of hazardous materials in relation to radiation risks

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
	advertisement is included in Appendix D of this report. Urbis Engagement hosted two community information pop-up sessions on 17 and 18 May 2024. Members of the GDA project team and Urbis' Engagement and Community Planning teams attended the pop-up sessions. A copy of the display materials used at these sessions is included in Appendix B of this report.	One community member expressed concerns around battery safety risks due to an increase in solar flares, advising solar flares create a risk of batteries exploding. The community member suggested inspections of the BESS after any solar flare events.	The proposal does not pose any radiation risks. Should the proposal be approved, the BESS will be remotely monitored during operation, with maintenance personnel on call to visit the site in the event of any alarms or alerts.
		Concerns regarding solar and/or wind infrastructure Some community members expressed negative sentiment towards renewable developments such as solar and wind.	Concerns regarding solar and/or wind infrastructure The proposal does not involve solar or wind infrastructure.
		Concerns around loss of agricultural land One community member expressed concerns in relation to renewable developments taking up agricultural land.	Concerns around loss of agricultural land The proposal site has not been used as productive agricultural land for the past 25 years and has no future planned agricultural use.
		Enquiries Some questions were raised by community members, requesting information in relation to: Whether the proposal will power local homes.	Enquiries Should the proposal be approved, the BESS will contribute to general grid stability, reliability and affordability, powering up to 28,000 homes.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project response
		2. The source of the energy stored in the BESS.	2. The existing Deniliquin substation is the source of the energy which will be stored in the BESS, should the proposal be approved.
Deniliquin Community Group	Urbis Engagement emailed Deniliquin Community Group on 7 May 2024. This email provided information about the proposal along with the community newsletter, details for how to provide feedback, and an invitation to an individual online briefing.	To date, no response has been received from Deniliquin Community Group.	GDA will continue to inform Deniliquin Community Group as plans progress.