



RE: Rye Park Wind Farm Project Application – Application Number SSD 6693

Attention: Executive Director, Resource Assessments & Business Systems.

I have noted as being identified as a 'stakeholder' by the proponent in appendix A of appendix J of the 'response to submissions' by the proponent in a number of categories.

The proponent has clearly listed every and any organization that exists or has some relationship with the Rye Park area. These include LachLandcare of which I was chair (stepped down from the role in November last year).

I would like to highlight that there has never been any correspondence received from Epuron or Trust Power by LachLandcare, nor has LachLandcare ever sent information to the proponent. The reference of LachLandcare as a stakeholder is inappropriate in the context that the proponent has not made any effort to contact LachLandcare in any capacity, and if the proponent considers LachLandcare to be a stakeholder, it has failed in its responsibility to engage with all stakeholders.

I would like to also point out the blatant prejudice the proponent has shown to me by identifying me as the chair of LachLandcare. There are 19 'community groups' listed in appendix J, all associations with active governance committees and chairperson positions in place. I was the only individual identified as a chair in any of those 19 community groups.

I ask the proponent for an explanation as to why I was identified in this way and for what purpose?

I also note that the Boorowa District Landscape Guardians was listed in the category of 'opinion leaders'. The BDLG is a community group and as such should have been listed in the 'community group' section.

The BDLG has not received any correspondence, direct or indirect from the proponent in at least 12 months and identifying BDLG as a stakeholder is grossly inappropriate, and clearly demonstrates that the proponent is not interested in engaging with 'stakeholders' or the community generally, and therefore failed in its responsibility, as per the Director Generals requirements, to consult with the community.

And again identifying my directorship role in the Waubra Foundation is prejudicial and inappropriate in the context that the directorship roles of any other individuals have not been identified for any other organizations.

Again I ask the proponents for an explanation as to why I was identified in this way and for what purpose?

I have my suspicions and I would appreciate the individuals who wrote appendix J to grow some balls and answer the above questions.



I therefore request that serious consideration be given by the Department of Planning and Environment of the issues raised in this submission and that of the resubmitted BDLG submission, and that the Department **not allow approval** of this proposal.

I RESERVE THE RIGHT TO SUBMIT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO THIS PRELIMINARY SUBMISSION

Charlie Arnott