

Infigen produces an EIS containing environmental assessment areas stipulated by DPE, nothing more, nothing less.

On Page 8 of the EIS for the Flyers Creek wind farm Modification 4, Infigen writes:

The scope of the environmental assessments which require to be reviewed and updated to reflect the proposed modification were determined in consultation with the Department of Planning and Environment.

In effect we have an abridged SEARs, negotiated and unpublished. The Department must publish all documents covering this agreement in fairness to the community. The negotiated scope of assessment contained the following traditional environmental topics:

Visual; Shadow flicker; Bird and bat; Noise; Traffic and transport; Electromagnetic interference (telecommunications); Aviation; Biodiversity and Aboriginal and historical heritage.

What is missing?

Section 4.15 of the EP&A Act lists other areas that must be considered in evaluating an SSD. They include:

- social and economic impacts in the locality
- the suitability of the site for the development
- the public interest.

These areas were not addressed in the original EIS or the Assessment or the Determination and therefore need to be addressed as part of this Assessment.

This presents a difficulty for the Department of Planning. No wind farm developer includes anything in an EIS that is not required and most often leaves out much that is. All DGRs or their covering letter include the caveat that they can be changed at any time. It must be assumed that these negotiated abridged DGRs can be similarly altered. They must be. All areas currently missing from the negotiated scope of assessment must be included.

In the 9 years since the DGRs were issued, all those areas above that are missing have changed considerably. For instance, it can be strongly argued that wind farms are no longer in the public interest. Arguments against the other topics are equally persuasive. Until the EIS addresses these key points of determination, the modification, in fairness to the impacted community, cannot be approved. To do so would be construed, once again, as behaviour partial to the developer.