

## COMMUNICATIONS

Appendix K of the EIS for the Jupiter proposal supposedly addresses EMI and EMF assessment. As I have become accustomed to, the information in this document has little relevance to the project area, and appears to have been generated from a desktop study.

I note with interest the section on CB Radio and mobile phones. The mitigation strategy for affected reception is to *“move to an area of better reception.”* My house is not portable, nor do I live in a caravan. Mobile phone reception is marginal at best (independent of carrier), and I already am required to leave my phone in selected areas of my house in order to maximise my level of service. If my mobile service is further reduced as a result of this proposal, what am I to do? Rebuild on a site of better reception? Am I supposed to create polar diagrams of signal strength on my own property?

### IS THIS NOT A FUNCTION THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT BY THE CONSULTANT?

Telstra and Optus have been asked to comment on the impact of this proposal on their services. Why would these companies waste resources researching this information for DNV GL? They don't! Their answer is of course, non-binding. If reception is reduced, it isn't their fault. Again, the consultant is too lethargic to do any of the work themselves, above what can be performed via a phone call or email.

Our family receives internet through this sporadic 3G service. We use this connection for secondary school and tertiary study, along with working from home. What will be done to ensure that these activities can continue if our 3G service is destroyed?

Our mobile phones are our life-line. During the recent (wind farm initiated) Currandooley wildfire, my family relied upon RFS status information and warnings that were delivered by SMS in order to initiate our bushfire survival strategy. What mitigation will be put in place to ensure that no residents fail to receive these vital warnings? **Who will explain to the Coroner why entire families remained in place when unreceived advice was to evacuate?**

Satellite television is offered as an alternative to terrestrial television. Again, this is a poor option in a high bushfire risk area. Local residents rely upon emergency information delivered by their local television stations. Satellite delivered TV is location agnostic. This vital information is unavailable through this service.

The third vital emergency warning service is the local ABC radio station, 666 Canberra. Again, due to the terrain, this service is sporadic as well, although much more stable at night. Any reduction in signal strength will invalidate its usefulness.

The annex is full of non-committal terms, like “generally”, “Should”, “typically” and the like. These terms only used since there has been absolutely no ground based study performed on the project area.

The Cumulative impacts paragraph tells all. *“...the possibility exists for cumulative impacts to point-to-multipoint stations, mobile phones, wireless internet, Citizens Band (CB) radio and television services. Options exist to mitigate most interference issues should they occur.”*

Those mitigations are as follows:

**Mobile Phones:** *"In case of marginal network coverage, simple procedures are available to mitigate interference, such as moving a short distance to a new or higher location until the signal improves, or using an external antenna to improve the signal."*

This mitigation is useless for a residence. A residence may not be moved to higher ground. This mitigation is irrelevant.

**Wireless Internet:** *"Yless4U Pty Ltd may provide wireless internet services to dwellings in the vicinity of the PA; however it is not possible to identify customers who are using the Yless4U Broadband service. As part of an extensive consultation process, the broadband service provider has been contacted to assess any adverse impacts on their services, arising from the Project development and operation. No formal response has been received to date."*

This section doesn't offer mitigation at all – no response from the operator. Surely this is not a mitigation strategy? What does it mitigate? Can the risk be written off this flippantly? Where are the polar diagrams for this service in the area? Also, this section completely overlooks the fact that many residents use the 3G mobile networks as their internet source. In this case, the mitigation would be the same as for mobile phones, and as such, totally unsuitable for a residence.

**Radio Broadcasting:** *"This can be mitigated by the installation of a high quality antenna."*

My vehicles already have high gain antennae. This cannot be upgraded. AM reception in my house is marginal during daylight hours. This mitigation is useless in my instance.

**Television Broadcasting:** Seven mitigation strategies are proposed. Residents have already aligned their aerials to maximise reception. Most residents can only see one of the three sources if any at all. Current digital TV aerials are already high gain. Who will relocate an aerial? The proponent, or is this cost to be borne by the resident? As mentioned earlier, satellite TV and its lack of local focus is unsuitable for a high bushfire risk rural residential location.

**Electromagnetic emissions from WTG's:** *"DNV GL has deemed that EMF strengths and EMR levels are likely to be within limits imposed by applicable guidelines and no adverse impacts are expected."* (my emphasis)

What does this statement mean? What research has been performed to return a result of "likely"? Does the manufacturer of the turbine not publish these levels such that they can be considered against relevant standards? This appears to be yet another "No research, No care, No responsibility" throw-away line from DNV GL.

In conclusion, this assessment appears to have been conducted via a few Google searches and the odd phone call, which may or may not have been answered. It appears to have precious little relevance to the project area in question. The potential impacts upon residents is totally unknown, and the majority of mitigation strategies are inappropriate for the area, given the life-saving reliance that the community has on the feeble communications that it already has.

To attempt to patch things up once they have been broken is an unprofessional way to conduct business, and raises the risk to life to an unacceptable level. Unfortunately, sloppy research has become the norm with this proponent and their consultants. The majority of EIS chapters are cut and pasted from previous documents (predominantly Biala), and have no relevance for the area within this proposal.

This area is totally inappropriate for this proposed wind farm, and no amount of pseudo mitigation will change that fact.