

I object to the proposed industrial wind project "Spicers Creek" SSD-41134610

### Water

A number of watercourses run through the project area. The Water Resources Impact Assessment (WRIA) appears to have a large amount of computer modelling. They mention a "*water source strategy*" yet I am unable to find a clear explanation of that strategy apart from a lot of hand waving and '*according to the blue book*'.

They state they will require 80-120ML of water during construction yet are vague in where it will come from apart from this huge quantity of water likely to be trucked in or bought from local landowner's dams and bores.

What about the damage from run-off during construction? There are mentions of swathes of cleared land, newly cut roads and more. The Biodiversity report states "*The Project Site includes areas with highly erodible soils and potentially dispersive soils. The steep gradients across parts of the Project Site and the infrastructure (access tracks and cables) that will cross streams further add to the potential for erosion of soils and the subsequent pollution of surface water resources*". Wind projects in the south of the state have experienced severe damage from run-off with valuable cropping paddocks destroyed. This cannot be allowed to happen here. The WRIA clearly states that the mitigation measures will be addressed during the "*detailed design period*". This is obfuscation. As these mitigation measures have not yet been worked out, how can we comment on whether they are sufficient or not? Are we meant to TRUST a for-profit developer that they will do the right thing? I think not.

### Biodiversity

The wind project sits adjacent to the Dapper Nature Reserve with several turbines sited adjacent to the park's boundaries. National Parks & Wildlife describe it thus "*The Reserve is ... a winter visiting site for birds that breed in the Blue Mountains and the Liverpool Ranges in the spring and summer. White box, and mugga are important in the area as sources of nectar for insects, nomadic honeyeaters and lorikeets which follow the flowering of eucalyptus.*"

The Biodiversity Report states "*the proximity of these wind turbines to the Dapper Nature Reserve is likely to pose an increased risk to bird species ... inhabiting the Reserve*". It is important to remember that wildlife – fauna and birds – do not respect park boundaries. Avian fauna in particular traverse through parks. Instead of being a refuge, the Reserve with turbines on a portion of its boundaries will become dangerous to travelling birds, particularly raptors, bats and other birds flying at the same altitudes as the turbine blades.

Construction noise will push fauna away into other reaches of the Reserve, or out of the Reserve altogether, negatively affecting their potential habitat and surrounding farmland. Operational noise, particularly the little-researched low frequency noise, may also interfere with native fauna (land and avian). Whilst Squadron Energy claim their placement of turbines 284m from the Reserve is sufficient, this is far too little for avian fauna and the turbines near the Reserve's boundaries should be removed from the project.

Local Land Services have identified multiple threatened species in the area of the project, including bats, birds, reptiles and marsupials. Yet the EIS only clearly discusses the Barking Owl, the Superb Parrot and the Glossy Black Cockatoo and the recommendations purely seem centred around leaving

a buffer around nests, which hardly seems sufficient. The endangered White Throated Needletail has been found in a significant portion of the development footprint, yet no specific mitigation factors are attached.

A number of other avian species are listed with a high-risk. Why are these not addressed in detail?

Migratory species are described as having a potential significant disruption to migratory routes and potential for mortality. A full survey needs to be undertaken during times of migration to ascertain exactly how big this “potential” is.

Why have Impact Triggers and Response Procedures for Threatened Species and Reporting Requirements been listed as “not applicable”? Surely both of these need to be addressed on an ongoing basis.

Their identified endangered flora does not detail the protection of the critically endangered Small Purple Pea. This needs to be addressed.

Very concerning is the fact that the Baseline Surveys are still on going until well in to 2024. The EIS should be re-submitted for public comment AFTER all surveys have been fully completed and can be assessed in detail.

The purchase of biodiversity credits or offsets does NOT assist the affected species living in the district in a meaningful way and only provides the proponent with an easy answer when damaging the biodiversity of the area.

I reserve the right to add to my objection at a later date.

Annette Piper