EIS submission

There are two parties making this submission jointly as detailed below. Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission

Parties making submission:

Ms Peta Lisle:

I am making this submission as a Resident of Walcha, and the daughter of a Winterbourne Wind Leasee (Wind Farm Host).

Residential/postal address: 14N Pakington Street, Walcha 2354.

Phone: 0408 084 4455.

Email: p_m_lisle@yahoo.com.au

Mr Peter Lisle:

I am making this submission as a Resident of Walcha, and a Winterbourne Wind Leasee (Wind Farm host) at property 'Wattle Hill' 1964 Moona Road Walcha 2354 – WTG site B146.

Residential Address: 'Malford' 262 Emu Creek Road, Walcha 2354

Postal Address: PO Box 88 Walcha 2354

Phone: 0267 772009

EIS Submission:

1. **Plan for decommissioning:**
    a. The developer intends to avoid any contribution to a bond until they decide this 'might' be necessary when their first assessment occurs at 15 years of project life. There is no oversite, no arm's length bond held by an independent party, and no insurance against financial default. This a perfect recipe for 'walk away'.
    b. We propose there needs to be a bond for decommissioning for the life of the project. From day one onwards.

2. **Roads**
    a. **Damage to roads:**
        i. This project will cause significant impacts to local roads including Emu Creek Road, and the Moona Road. The local roads are not designed for ultra-heavy vehicles, or the volume of vehicles this project will require. There will be significant degradation of local roads.
        ii. Who will adequately deal with the costs of road repair? This is not properly dealt with in the EIS. Also, what happens at the end of the project when we have no negotiating power to hold the developer to account when road repair

is required? This is particularly relevant in the inevitable situation where the developer sells or transfers interests in the wind farm to another company who has no interest in the quality of Walcha's roads but only has interests in shareholders profits.

b. Increase road traffic:

i. The increased road traffic will lead to extensive delays, and stoppages. The EIS does not adequately address this matter.

ii. The turn off into 262 Emu Creek road is currently a blind corner that has significant risk of accident at the present time. The turn off is also a School Bus stop for two young children. The Emu Creek road is one of the main roads being used to access Wind Turbine Generator (WTG) sites. There will be an exponential increase in traffic. There is no doubt the chance of a serious to fatal accident is inevitable if road safety at the turn off to 262 Emu Creek road is not addressed. The EIS does not adequately address making local roads safe for an exponential increase in traffic.

c. Gravel for roads:

i. Where is all of the Gravel required for the construction of 113km (approx.) of road plus hardstands – estimated to be 850,000 tonnes coming from?

ii. The EIS does not adequately address gravel and water truck movements in their assessment. This may be due to the developer not knowing where this water and gravel is coming from. If the traffic movements estimated by Voice for Walcha are carried out in a 11 month period this amounts to an additional 800 truck movements (allowing for both directions of travel) per day.

3. Poor site selection:

a. Site selection has been driven by wind records. This fails to take into consideration developers statutory obligations to consider feasible alternatives. For example on the Leasee's (Wind Farm Host) property ('Wattle Hill' 1964 Moona Road) one turbine (B146) is proposed on a stunning view over Oxley Wild Rivers National park, part of the world heritage Gondwana Rain Forests.

4. Water

a. Significant water impact

i. The EIS suggests the requirement for 150 megalitre (ML). The EIS also states 6ML for concrete foundations but simple arithmetic of 20% of 750cubic meters per foundation by 119 turbines give 17.8ML. Similarly dust suppression has been grossly understated using industry estimates. Vestas project director had earlier stated that 220ML will be required. This would be a considerable underestimate. Realistic calculation would suggest a conservative 675ML is required.

b. Water Source

i. EIS suggests water will come from harvestable rights. Bores in the area, farm dams or from Walcha Council supply. The scale of the water requirements is staggering. It will empty the Walcha storage dam currently under construction more than twice. Put another way it is 56,000 x 12,000 truckloads travelling on the Walcha roads.

ii. We propose the supply of water be detailed with specific detail by the developer.

5. Poor consultation:

a. There has been a poor consultation in relation to specific detail. For a development that has potentially a 62 years project life, a minimum requirement would be to have consultation with specific detail.

b. In addition contract confidentiality clauses restricts consultation with fellow wind farm leasee's (Wind Farm Hosts), and neighbours. Furthermore, it is difficult to get in contact with Vestas to discuss details. For instance for almost two years we have been trying to have our email address changed with Vestas. Emails have not been answered, phone calls not addressed, and in person requests ignored.

6. Fire hazard:

a. The recent (05 January 2022) turbine fire near Goulbourn is of concern. How much of a fire risk are the WTG turbines? How would such a fire be dealt with in this wind project? This is not adequately addressed in the EIS submission.

7. Diminished Aviation Services:

a. Spreading of fertilizer, seed, and chemical under threat with WTG creating a no fly zone near rural airstrips and low cloud conditions. National parks also flag concerns with aerial wild dog baiting.

8. Bush fire:

a. With WTG creating no fly zones, water collection from paddocks west of project of area, while Oxley Wild Rivers on the east of the project area, we lose our most important aerial tools for gorge fire control. Of particular concern is the location of the WTGs against the national park strategic fire advantage zone critical to wildfire control.

9. Turbine technology:

a. By the time this project gets underway the Vestas turbine are more than likely to be outdated in Australia. There are now more advanced turbines not requiring the height of the towers specified in this wind project.

b. We propose that Walcha not be burdened with high WTGs no longer necessary for wind power generation.

10. **Transmission lines:**
    a. Are the transmission lines connecting turbines above or below ground? If transmission lines are above ground (aerial) how are neighbours who have no wind turbines compensated? Noting the neighbour benefit fund, which was initially proposed by the developer and recently scrapped is an equitable and fair course of action for compensation to neighbours for transmission lines and the right of ways they create for maintenance.

11. **Community Fund**
    a. While this concept has merits, there are inherent problems with the current structure. In order for the community fund to be transparent and without bias it needs to be managed by persons who are independent. That is not managed by leasees (Wind Farm Hosts) or those with a perceived or actual conflict of interest with a leassees (Wind Farm Hosts).
    b. With an estimated $200 Mega Watt per hour pricing, this project is likely to generate $420 million annually. Lease agreements with Wind Farm hosts is likely to be around $3.6M in total per year, and the community fund $0.75 Million per year. The community fund is grossly inadequate for the toll wind farms take on the community, within the Walcha area.
    c. An Off-shore turbines manufacturer and developer is taking advantage of Walcha as with little regard to the long terms impacts to the community and environment.
