

This submission raises concerns from residents as to the general conduct of EPYC, their use of process that is devoid of meaningful consultation and the poor quality of information contained within various sections of the Jupiter wind farm EIS

EPYC have, from the moment it identified host properties, demonstrated little concern for other entities associated with this project and its planning. I find it difficult to reconcile the following:

- EPYC steadfastly continued to trespass on non-hosting properties in defiance of direction given to them by the Department of Environment and Planning for a period of many weeks. EPYC then attempted to claim these trespasses as some kind of “consultation”.
- EPYC have shown apparent little concern toward any individual or group that it has not identified as being in alliance with them. Emails are ignored, telephone calls remain unanswered and/or not returned, information was withheld, and any answers squeezed from EPYC by the CCC remain obtuse, vague, non-committal or provided with a thinly veiled threat of legal recourse.
- EPYC appear to me to have shown contempt for the legal framework supporting the application process, specifically statements contained within the EIS, in which they pledge that the contents of the EIS are not false or misleading. Simple analysis of several EIS documents reveal otherwise. Two specific cases in point are (but not limited to):
 1. EPYC appear to have provided false and misleading information in the Transport section of the EIS, in which they have declared that there are no school bus routes that run along Braidwood road between Tarago and the King’s Highway. This is despite the fact that they have been directly cautioned on a number of occasions by concerned residents that this is not the case, and that these residents hold grave fears for the safety of their children who use the four bus services that ply that route. Further, two of the bus stops are in close proximity to project traffic concentration points, and as such, children’s safety will be critically compromised by construction traffic.
 2. EPYC have omitted information in the Aviation section of the EIS, in which they claim that there are no Aviation Landing Areas (ALA’s) within 12 Km of the project area boundary. This is absolutely untrue. There are at least 4 private airstrips that exist within 5Km of the project boundary, including two that have approaches that are within the 16D (16 rotor diameter) zone of turbulence identified in that document. Admittedly, it is doubtful if these ALA’s exist on CASA’s database, but as ultra-light airstrips, they do not need to. They still are though, by definition aircraft landing areas which use ultra-light aircraft which are highly susceptible to turbulence influence. EPYC have been aware of at least the airstrip located on Kalbili Close, since three turbines were deleted from the property of Red Hill as a result of a complaint from the Kalbili Close pilot, as they were in the direct path of the approach to this airstrip. This fact was admitted at the CCC held on the 13th of December by the EPYC Project Manager, Ibrahim Eid. Again, for EPYC to endorse the statement of there not being any ALA’s within 12Km of the project area could be considered to be a deliberate act of deceit.

I believe it is no secret that there is little trust between the local community and EPYC. That lack of trust has a deep seated and well founded base, as the community has, to my mind, been treated poorly by this company. The NSW Department of Planning and Environment is demonstrating itself as being an impotent body that is unable to faithfully represent the welfare of the public which is a value it aspires to hold. The community requires it to stand up to the wind industry on occasions that bind it to do so. Public faith in the DPE is being seriously eroded with each discrepancy that is identified within this document set that has been deemed suitable for public exhibition by the Department of Planning and Environment on its second pass.

At what point, is the Department of Planning and Environment going to call this company and its agents to account for what appear to be breaches of the legal requirement of the EIS to be true, accurate and faithful to the community, the environment and the general public? Is it not a duty of care of the Department to do so?