E-mail Message

jackie rovensky [SMTP:jarbath@yahoo.com.au]
office@Baird.Premier.nsw.gov.au [SMTP:office@Baird.Premier.nsw.gov.au],
Stokes Office Email [EX:/O=MIN/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=7665152DA020AB49ABE35242D2EB7AE9-
0001278FAB08], Public Skinner's Office Email [EX:/O=MIN/OU=EXCHANGE
ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5AC6AD7B09FE1A48808B23FEDCEF8244-
00000045A84], Public Goward's Office Email [EX:/O=MIN/OU=EXCHANGE
ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5AC6AD7B09FE1A48808B23FEDCEF8244-
000000059ADC], Public Roberts' Office Email [EX:/O=MIN/OU=EXCHANGE
ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5AC6AD7B09FE1A48808B23FEDCEF8244-
00000059AEC1
23/10/2014 at 12:22 PM
23/10/2014 at 12:22 PM
Capital II Infigen queries to answer
Infigens request for Bigger Blades.docx Corro Action Sheet - ED.doc

Please find attached comment on the announcement that Infigen are requesting to seek to be able to use larger turbine blades for Capital II.

JA Rovensky

After reading an article in The Canberra Times dated 17 October 2014, by Emma Kelly titled 'Australia's biggest blades slated for proposed wind farm'

It is clear the writer and the commentator from Clean Energy Council (CEC), an industry promotional body, needed to clarify statements made.

They say the largest turbine blades in the UK and Denmark are 80 metres but do not say these are located off-shore, not on-shore and I believe Capital II is not off-shore. Nor do they inform the reader that these blades can travel at 80metres per second or 290km per hour. Surely concern about environmental damage caused by the wind draft from these massive blades should be considered.

Nor does the writer or the CEC adviser mention for an off-shore 3MW turbine in 2011 the foundations weighed in at around 800 tons, so it can be assumed a 6MW would require a larger foundation capacity. What impacts does 800 tons plus have on the environment?

Further, off-shore turbines which support these large blades are 6MW not 3MW or 3.5MW. Will Infigen be asking for a change to the MW capacity of the turbines to ensure the larger blades will be able to operate without structural failure to the tower or nacelle? Will they reduce the number of turbines in accordance with an apparent greater capacity bigger blades and possibly greater MW's could possibly produce? If they do increase the MW capacity how heavy will the foundations need to be and what environmental effect will ensue?

Why is Infigen requesting larger blades?

Exactly what Infigen is requesting and why, needs to be addressed? This information also needs to be made available to the public for their comment. After all it will be the community who will be living with these turbines and unlike off-shore turbines people will be living and working in close proximity to these things.

Perhaps, those who will be considering Infigen's request would do well to access and read widely from sources other than those provided by Infigen or the CEC, one of which should be:

McMurtry, R.Y. & Krough, C. M. E. (2014). Diagnostic criteria for adverse health effects in the environs of wind turbines. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine Open*, 5(10), 1-5.