

22/10/2017

To whom it may concern,

I am writing on behalf of Hume Pastoral Company to lodge concerns about the modifications to the Coppabella Wind Farm SSD-6698.

Firstly a concern is the increased clearing of native vegetation from 68.3 hectares to 180.9 hectares. The vegetation includes White Box, Yellow Box, and Red Gum in an endangered ecological area. The area to be cleared is vulnerable to erosion, the removal of more vegetation will increase the risk of erosion. It is my understanding that the Coppabella's are prone to erosion because of the gradient and soil type being very fragile, land clearing would only increase the risk of land erosion and land degradation. Once this has occurred it is extremely difficult to repair the land and prevent further degradation. The occurrence of such an event would render the land useless for ongoing use in agriculture and/or any other use. Any land degradation is environmental vandalism. Mitigation strategies are discussed the success of these strategies are variable. Offsets in other locations do not help the involved site.

Secondly we are concerned about the increase in size of the wind turbines, the increase in size from 150m to 171m will further impede the ability of local community to enjoy the pristine natural landscape that currently exists in the area. The increase in size will create more of a burden on the landscape affecting land values and peoples enjoyment of the natural environment. The visual impact assessment of 3.4km is inadequate due to the size of the structures. Our business that includes accommodation for tourists is 25km from the site and will have direct sight of the majority of the project. The main aspect of view is directly at the project site. With scattered tree obstructing some turbines. Our residences were not assessed in the EIS as we are outside of the 3.4km range. However the project will greatly affect our views. The lighting at night will also be a burden on our and our guests quiet enjoyment of our environment.

Another concern also is that the increase in size is required to keep up with advances in the industry. If this increase in size is required to make the project competitive, how long will it be before further advances are made making the project redundant? The increase in size is required due to the advances over 8 years. Does this mean that in 8 years' time or less the project will become outdated and to inefficient when compared to new technology that the project will be rendered uncompetitive in the market? Once this happens who is responsible for the removal of the wind turbines and land rehabilitation of the area? Will it ever be able to be rehabilitated back to its former state?

Our firm is also concerned about bird life being impacted, a mitigation strategy is spoken of in the EIS. This strategy is the removal of carcasses from the area, who is responsible for this? I highly doubt that people will be employed to remove carcasses from the area for the life of the project, the size of the site would also mean the undertaking of this strategy would need to be on a significant scale. Is this achievable and realistic?

Our Organisation is concerned about possible workplace health and safety impacts to our business if there is an effect on mobile coverage. The Hilltops shire has patchy

mobile reception already. Our property receives Telstra reception from Conroy's Gap, this is in direct line over the proposed site. There is mitigation strategies mentioned in the EIS however there are no guarantees that we will not be affected. Increasing the size of the towers will only increase the chance of our workplace and residence being negatively affected. Due to the remote and isolated nature of our workplace phone coverage is needed to communicate with staff and forms an integral part of our business.

Our final concern is regarding fire risk. The EIS has no mention of fire mitigation strategies. My concern is how does the project plan on mitigating the risk of fire during construction, maintenance and equipment failure once the project is operational? Does the project have a plan to safely remove staff from the site if there is a fire? The Coppabella's are in an area that is prone to fires and the land formations means firefighting access is difficult and exit from the mountains is also difficult. This may compromise the safety of project staff and surrounding communities.

Thank you for your time, I hope my concerns are taken into consideration when making your decision.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ian Hume', written in a cursive style.

Ian Hume