



CWO REZist Inc.
c/- PO Box 2
Coolah NSW 2843

CWOREZist@gmail.com

CWO REZist opposes the industrial wind project "Baldon".

Industrial wind turbines will never provide the baseload power that our country needs, therefore the "project need" is redundant. The proponent, Chinese based Goldwind, is a multinational corporation - they are not proposing this project for the public good of the residents of NSW, they are proposing this project for PROFIT. To state under project need, to meet the ill-informed government climate targets is disingenuous, meaningless and proves this section is a box ticking exercise that is used by every wind developer.

Wind turbines are not 'ecologically sustainable'. Consideration needs to be given to mining for metal and materials, manufacturing, shipping and transport, clearing of land, blasting, underground cabling, cement, high voltage transmission infrastructure, maintenance, decommissioning and recycling. If this is done honestly, it is apparent that industrial turbines are far from "sustainable".

The residents of the SW REZ were not properly consulted regarding being placed in a renewable energy zone which will result in their whole district being substantially changed from rural to industrial, as has been admitted by Energy Co in the CWO REZ.

Social licence is based heavily on a survey completed by 25 people and interviews with 24 people. References to community drop in session comments mention "a few" and "several". It is obvious from this data that in the district that the SIA quotes as containing in excess of 22,000 people, that engaging with less than 0.3% of the population is insufficient. The proponent has not made sufficient efforts regarding consulting with the local community and DPHI should request the community be engaged with in more meaningful ways and their feedback received by DPHI, before this project be considered for approval.

The location of this project is too close to Yanga National Park. Fauna does not respect boundaries and will likely result in high numbers of avian fauna deaths by blade strike. The cumulative effect from multiple wind projects in the district also must be considered. The project will affect areas of Threatened Ecological Communities. Offsets will not cure the destruction from this and the cumulative projects in the SW REZ.

There are more unassociated dwellings within the 8000m buffer zone than associated. It therefore appears that inadequate consultation has occurred with these neighbours or they do not want them on their doorstep. Considering the turbines are 300m tall, these dwellings will experience negative effects (visual, noise,

health), as well as likely to negatively affect their and neighbour's land values. Commercial agreements should be required with EVERY unassociated dwelling within 8km and if these are not gained, then offending turbines need to be removed from the project.

The lengthy construction period of 36 months will heavily impact residents for 3 years and their daily lives will be confronted by this extended period of negative impacts from increased workers, increased traffic, OSOM trucks etc.

The proponent lists multiple projects nearby. DPHI needs to consider the cumulative effects for the whole REZ including future (not approved) projects and the negative effects that will impact residents living amongst these power generators, many of whom have never agreed to having their landscape changed so drastically.

No groundwater or aquifer access should be allowed for the project's water needs, as this will negatively affect the wider district's access to bore water. This should be a condition of consent if the project gains approval.

The proponent's aviation consultant, Aviation Projects, has recently implemented a reduced consideration in all wind projects they have been contracted for, for wake/turbulence from turbines to be only 10 rotor diameters. There is a lack of recent real-world studies regarding wake and turbulence on aircraft from large turbines and the studies the proponent is basing their estimates on, are heavily weighted for wake/turbulence on other turbines only, not, for example, light aircraft. The published standard calculation in Australia is for 16 rotor diameters (see https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/4.1.3_Guideline_D_Wind_Turbines.pdf). Note, the turbines being considered for this project have a 205m diameter. Consideration also needs to be given to the 16 rotor diameters in the CIRCUIT area, **not just the landing area**. The proponent should not be able to unilaterally alter the standard for their own benefit. DPHI must request the proponent to recalculate turbulence and wake effects on any nearby unassociated ALAs using the standard 16 rotor diameters.

The Aviation report appears to not consider VFR flight in stress of weather conditions when low flying is permitted below 500ft. In these cases, visibility is relaxed to 5km, aircraft must remain clear of cloud/smoke and in sight of ground or water (Ref: AIP ENR1.2). Further reduction in visibility is allowed to 1500m for fixed wing or 800m for helicopters, if below 140 knots airspeed. The off-white colour of the turbines will not contrast with rain, cloud or smoke especially in low-light conditions. Obstacle lighting and high-visibility markings would be of benefit in these conditions.

Only considering the fine weather situation ignores the poor weather case which is when most terrain collision accidents occur. Doing a risk assessment matrix then failing to include the worst-case is deceptive and negligent.

The proponent has stated that "Aerial firefighting organisations have formal risk management programs to assess the risks associated with their operations and implement

applicable treatments to ensure an acceptable level of safety can be maintained. For example, pilots require specific training and approvals, additional equipment is installed in the aircraft, and special procedures are developed.” Stating that routine aviation risk management strategies are used does not address the fundamental problem. Routine risk management will dictate that Large Air Tankers, and probably Small Air Tankers as well, stay clear of turbine areas when visibility is obscured by smoke. Aerial firefighting will be restricted in and adjacent to the project area. In smoke and with turbulence, air tankers will have to stay outside of, or well above turbine areas, thus making them ineffective.

The proponent’s statements around decommissioning are vague and inadequate, with no real oversight by DPHI. There appears (already) to be an avoidance of responsibility with regard to decommissioning, stating not all underground reticulation will be removed and some access roads and infrastructure may remain in place.

Decommissioning and rehabilitation need actual responsibility and guarantees undertaken by the proponent with FULL rehabilitation, including removing of underground infrastructure and undertaking the monetary responsibility for the cost of doing so. This should be a condition of consent if the project gains approval.

CWO REZist Inc.
31 August 2024