



Capital II Wind Farm – Part 3A Major Project
MP 10_0135

Submissions Response Report

Monday 28 March 2011

ATTACHMENTS

- A Revised Statement of Commitments
- B Email from the RTA dated 2 February 2011
- C Updated Table 6 of Volume One of the Environmental Assessment
- D Figure of Identifying Crown Road Crossings
- E Revised Archaeology Report
- F Preferred Project Layout Report

SUBMISSION NUMBER	RESPONSE	LOCATION COVERED
Government Department Submissions		
<u>Submission One</u> - Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) dated 21 January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As agreed with the RTA by email on 2 Feb 2011 (see Appendix A), daily and peak hour traffic volumes and additional information will be provided as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), prior to commencement of construction. 	Statement of Commitments 13.6
<u>Submission Three</u> – Land and Property Management Authority dated 4 February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trigonometric Reserves. No physical access to a Trig Reserve is required. The nearest wind turbines to the Trig Reserves are five and eight kilometres distant. As such, there are no proposed works within, or in the vicinity of, the Trig Reserves. Crown Road Reserves. The LPMA requires the Proponent to coordinate submission of applications by adjoining landowners to close Crown Road Reserves. The Proponent has no authority to require landowners to make such an application. The Crown Road Reserves will not be used for construction and will only need to be crossed. Map included in Attachment D to this Submissions Report An application for a licence to cross Crown Road Reserves will be submitted to LPMA once the exact points of intersection are determined. Waterways. Consent will be sought from the LPMA before any work or activities are carried out on the bed or banks of Crown waterways. No new waterway crossings are expected to be required. It is likely that the existing crossing of Taylors Creek may be augmented, however all necessary measures will be taken to ensure that no adverse effects to the bed or banks, restriction of flows or water quality will occur. A comprehensive visual assessment has been completed and it has determined that the proposal will visually integrate into the landscape resulting in an acceptable visual impact on the existing landscape character and amenity, which includes the Lake George landscape. 	<p>Statement of Commitments 11a</p> <p>Submissions Report Attachment D</p> <p>Statement of Commitments 11b</p> <p>EA Chapter 7 & Appendix A</p>
<u>Submission Seven</u> – Office of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All water requirements will be met by existing water supplies. Any 	EA Chapter 13 & Statement of

Water dated 7 February 2011	<p>additional water demand that requires a licence will be covered through the CEMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent will provide the CEMP to DoP for review and consultation on mitigation measures. 	Commitments 15(i)
<p>Submission Eight– NSW Department of Climate Change & Water (DECCW) dated 7 February 2011</p>	<p>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</p> <p>As noted by the Department of Planning and Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, the Aboriginal Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report submitted as part of the Environmental Assessment inadvertently included AHIMS search results. The information provided in this report was prepared in consultation with the relevant Aboriginal stakeholders. The proposed transect survey methodology was adhered to throughout the survey. 100% survey coverage of the study area was attained and the footprint of both proposed projects fall within the study area. The proposed layouts have been specifically designed to avoid any works within the identified areas of Potential Archaeological Deposits (PADs). During construction, should additional unrecorded Aboriginal archaeological material be encountered within the project footprint, works will cease immediately in the vicinity to allow an archaeologist to make an assessment of the finds. The report has been amended and updated in March 2011, where required, to respond to the comments made on the EA by DECCW and DoP in the submissions from the DoP dated the 7th February 2011.</p> <p>Note - All Recommendations referred to in this section are referenced from the Aboriginal Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment by Austral Archaeological dated March 2011.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Previous Archaeological Investigations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Aboriginal Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report was prepared in accordance with the <i>Draft Guidelines for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment and Community Consultation (July 2005)</i> as required by the Director-General requirements issued on the 3rd September 2010. 	<p>Submissions Report Attachment E</p> <p>Submissions Report Attachment E</p>

	<p>b. Extensive review of previous archaeological investigations was undertaken as part of the Aboriginal Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment completed for Capital Wind Farm (Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd 2005 – Section 3.3 pp.14). The Heritage Assessment Report completed for the subject development considered the 2005 report, as well as the background information provided from other more recent archaeological investigations such as Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd, (2009) <i>Proposed Capital Wind Farm – Tarago Region NSW. Aboriginal Archaeological Excavation Report</i>, Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd (2010) <i>Woodlawn Wind Farm Transmission Line. Aboriginal Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Assessment Report</i>.</p> <p>c. As part of the current study, the additional archaeological investigations reviewed were undertaken for similar wind farm developments completed after the 2005 report. It is considered appropriate that the impact of a wind farm development on Aboriginal objects is considered in addition to consultation with the previous Austral report (2005). Additional background investigations of archaeological investigations completed after the 2005 report is unlikely to materially change the recommendations provided in the Aboriginal Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report prepared by Austral Archaeology in October 2010.</p> <p>2. Repositioning of Wind Turbines to Avoid Sites</p> <p>a. 100% survey coverage of the study area was attained. The proposed layout was modified in response to potential disturbance of recorded Aboriginal sites and in accordance with the wishes of the registered stakeholders expressed in verbal comments during the fieldwork and subsequently in written comments on the draft report.</p> <p>b. A Care and Control Agreement was prepared as part of an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Sub Plan in</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>conjunction with registered stakeholders for the Capital Wind Farm I project in 2007. Recommendation 5 alludes to adherence to this plan and indicates that the Sub Plan will be updated and incorporated into the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The Sub Plan provides for notification to DECCW in the event that salvage or relocation of artefacts occurs.</p> <p>3. All proposed layouts have been specifically designed to avoid any works within the identified areas of Potential Archaeological Deposits (PADs). Accordingly, no test excavation is required in these areas. As per Recommendation 2 in the amended Heritage Assessment Report prepared for public exhibition, should additional unrecorded Aboriginal archaeological material be encountered during the development, works will cease immediately to allow an archaeologist to make an assessment of the finds.</p> <p>4. The classification of sites CWF2-S-04, CWF2-S-06, CWF2-IF-07, CWF2-S-14 and CWF2-IF-20 as being possessed of moderate research potential within Table 9.1 of the Capital Wind Farm Aboriginal Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Assessment is correct but the summary classification of them as of low potential in Section 10.1 of the exhibited report was erroneous. CWF2-IF-10, is considered to be of low significance and as such its' classification in Section 10.1 was correct but its designation in Table 9.1 was erroneous. The report has been corrected and updated in March 2011.</p> <p>Justification for these conclusions follows:</p> <p>a) In the first instance CWF2-S-14 is an artefact scatter associated with CWF2-PAD-02. It contains rare artefacts, for example an edge ground axe head, is a representative example of a camp site <i>cum</i> knapping site as it includes both complete stone tools as well as evidence of stone tool construction and given its proximity to a known dreaming site (Lake</p>	<p>Statement of Commitments 16a</p> <p>Submissions Report Attachment F</p>
--	--	--

	<p>George) has the potential to facilitate research regarding many aspects of past Aboriginal lifeways. The edge ground axe head is of particular significance as it allows for inferences to be drawn regarding the geopolitical, cultural and social organisation of Aboriginal society over an area of a much larger portion of Australia than that represented within the study area.</p> <p>b) CWF2-S-04 is also an artefact scatter associated with CWF-PAD-02. It provides evidence of stone tool production and though situated on land that is partially disturbed still has the ability to contribute new information about the distribution and nature of past Aboriginal behaviour within the landscape.</p> <p>c) CWF2-S-06 is an artefact scatter that contains an edge ground axe head and when subjected to detailed investigation may yield further evidence of past Aboriginal life ways in this regard. Please refer to point 1a above.</p> <p>d) CWF2-IF-07 is a tool type of moderate rarity, good condition and representativeness in the archaeological record for the Southern Tablelands both in terms of its design (backed blade) and the clear evidence of usewear. Further investigation would likely increase the understanding of past Aboriginal activity within the study area.</p> <p>e) CWF2-IF-10 is a small quartz flake considered to be of low research potential as it is neither representative, rare, nor is it likely to increase the current understanding of past Aboriginal activity.</p> <p>f) CWF2-IF-20 is to be considered of moderate potential as it exhibits evidence of use as both a hammer stone and an anvil, as such it is possessed of a degree of rarity that may produce further</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>information once subjected to detailed analysis.</p> <p><i>The artefacts mentioned in (a) and (b) are part of PADs and as such fall under the existing management recommendations. The artefact mentioned in (e) was misclassified in Table 9.1 and is considered to be of low potential and as such falls under the existing management recommendations. The artefacts mentioned in (c), (d) and (f) require specific management. Should those artefacts be impacted by the proposed works, they will be collected and subject to lithic analysis but otherwise managed under the existing recommendations (and the ACHMP). The report has been amended and updated to reflect this – see Recommendation 1.</i></p> <p>5. A Cultural Heritage Management Sub Plan was prepared in conjunction with registered stakeholders for the Capital Wind Farm I project in 2007. Recommendation 5 alludes to adherence to this plan and indicates that the Sub Plan will be updated and incorporated into the CEMP. All necessary management measures will be included in the CEMP.</p> <p>6. See Points 4 and 4(e) above. CWF2-IF-10 was erroneously attributed “moderate potential” instead of “low potential” in Table 9.1 of the exhibited report. This oversight has been addressed in the revised report. Full consultation with the registered stakeholders was undertaken during the assessment.</p> <p>7. Comments received from the Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation (BNAC) were considered during both the fieldwork phase and the design process of the proposed layouts. In response to the issues raised, the proposed layouts were modified accordingly. Recommendation 1 has also been modified to include a requirement that as part of the CEMP, the final layout and report confirming the protection of all Aboriginal objects should be prepared and issued to the registered stakeholders (including BNAC) prior to implementation.</p> <p>8. Recommendation 2 refers to procedures to be followed in the event of discovery of additional unrecorded Aboriginal</p>	<p>Statement of Commitments 16</p> <p>Submissions Report Attachment E</p> <p>Submissions Report Attachment F</p>
--	---	--

	archaeological material during development,	Statement of Commitments 16a
	9. As explained above, appropriate consultation was undertaken with the relevant stakeholders regarding restriction of access to Aboriginal archaeological information.	
	10. The Aboriginal stakeholders were fully involved and consulted in relation to the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Sub Plan 2007 and the finalised plan reflects their requirements. Recommendation 5 alludes to adherence to this plan and indicates that the Sub Plan will be updated and incorporated into the CEMP.	
	11. Update of AHIMS database - the location of the 63 Aboriginal sites will be provided to DECCW for inclusion in the AHIMS database. This commitment will be part of the CEMP.	Statement of Commitments 16d
	12. As part of the CEMP, the final Aboriginal Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Assessment report prepared by Austral Archaeology will be provided to DECCW for inclusion in the AHIMS database.	Statement of Commitments 16c
	13. Consultation with the Aboriginal stakeholders was conducted prior to the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment.	
	14. Noted. The revised report has been updated.	Submissions Report Attachment E
	15. Noted. A Care and Control Agreement was prepared in consultation with stakeholders 2007. This provides for repatriation of artefacts to an agreed site in the CWF area. A site card will be forwarded to DECCW with the details of this site in due course. Therefore there will be no transfer of ownership to an Aboriginal community.	
	16. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Sub Plan will be part of the CEMP and once updated a copy can be forwarded to DECCW.	Statement of Commitments 16

	<p>17. A copy of the Austral Archaeology 2009 Aboriginal Archaeological Excavation Report for the Capital Wind Farm will be forwarded to DECCW for input into the AHIMS.</p> <p><i>Biodiversity and Threatened Species</i></p> <p>After consultation with the Department of Environment and Climate Change and Water, it was agreed that, wherever possible, the Proponent will commit to avoiding impacts on existing threatened species or endangered ecological communities that occur on the site. The Proponent will also commit to having a pre-construction biodiversity survey which will be conducted on those areas to be disturbed during construction during the optimal season for any threatened species or endangered ecological communities. Following the pre-construction surveys, should any threatened species or endangered ecological communities be identified an appropriate mitigation measures plan will be provided in the CEMP.</p> <p>Timing of Surveys</p> <p>Vegetation It is clear from the information presented in the report from Appendix D in the EA that enough effort was expended in gathering information on the vegetation present in the area. See detailed description of each tower array, survey plot information, photographs and mapping in that report. The time of year of the main surveys (April) was not important in determining if the grassland was native grassland or not.</p> <p>All relevant threatened plants are discussed. Searches were undertaken in this and past studies in areas of native grassland near wind farm infrastructure (always of low quality) and no threatened plants have ever been found on the Capital Wind Farm site. The low quality of the grassland precludes the occurrence of the species listed in DECCW submission. There are no local records of threatened plant species. The closest record of one species mentioned by DECCW, <i>Calotis glandulosa</i>, is 90 kilometres away to the west of the ACT, in completely different habitat.</p> <p>DECCW suggests that the surveys for threatened plants would be better</p>	<p>Statement of Commitments 16e</p> <p>Statement of Commitments 14b(ii), (iii), and (iv)</p>
--	--	--

	<p>undertaken during the flowering of the listed species. All of these species can be found outside their flowering period, but when flowering may be easier to locate, if present (except for <i>Thesium australe</i>). It is confirmed that all native grassland was surveyed under the footprint of the proposed wind farm (see page 2 of Appendix D of the EA). It is noted that 14b (iii).In the SOC makes a commitment to carry out further surveys within any area of native grassland potentially impacted by micro siting of the proposal.</p> <p>Animals A total of 20.8 hours of bird surveys was undertaken in the area during the most recent study, a large list of species known and potentially present is provided. Other fauna groups are largely absent from the farmland within the development area, and few were recorded.</p> <p>All relevant threatened animals are discussed. The three reptiles mentioned by DECCW are assessed in the report from Appendix D of the EA. Surveys were not considered necessary because there was no suitable habitat present. Again, the low quality of the grassland almost certainly precludes the presence of these species. In any case, the footprint of the wind farm within this native grassland is very small. It is again noted that 14b (v) in the SOC makes a commitment to search within habitat areas for reptiles prior to clearing.</p> <p>Timing of bird surveys. While it is often true that the early mornings are the best time for bird surveys, in treeless rural environments, timing does not matter too much. The recording of two threatened woodland birds during our surveys proves the point. Also, the best time to record diurnal birds of prey, a major target bird group, is in the heat of the middle of the afternoon. Similarly, time of day has little effect on waterbird surveys, another target group. We do not accept that the bird survey, which includes much data previously recorded from the site, is inadequate. DECCW do not identify any bird species they consider to be inadequately addressed.</p> <p>Reliance on previous survey results Combined with field studies, the use of existing information is a legitimate assessment method. Existing information was only used in compiling the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>list of known and likely local fauna. The gathering of existing information is an accepted step in environmental assessment; this is stated in the <i>Survey Guidelines</i> by DEC (2004) and in the <i>Part 3A Guidelines</i> (DEC 2005). The EA was undertaken specifically for this project and involved several days of investigation on the current wind farm proposal, the information gained in this study was what was used to undertake the environmental assessment.</p> <p>Survey Areas The tower numbers quoted in Appendix D Table 1, are superseded in the current application. Those numbers were simply used to identify the relevant array. The entire footprint of the current proposal was included in the surveyed area. All areas between the towers and the other associated infrastructure listed in Table 1 were investigated. Reading of the vegetation descriptions in Section 4.2 of Appendix D makes it quite clear that this is the case.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact The wind farm proposal has been assessed in conjunction with the existing wind farm and it has been determined to have a low impact on any threaten birds or bats. The cumulative impact may be proportionally increased due to the increase in the number of wind turbines. However, there is no evidence to prove that the cumulative impact would be greater then the proportional increase. There is a commitment in the SOC 20 that a monitoring program will be provided to the DoP, including bird and bat strikes, that will set out the appropriate mitigation techniques.</p> <p>Lake George water fowl Surveys As part of the statement of commitments 14b(iii) there will be a pre-construction biodiversity survey which will include the waterfowl.</p> <p>Water Bodies The difference with constructed water bodies is that they will likely hold water for a longer period over many more years than Lake George has typically experienced. Over the last couple of decades it is more common for Lake George to be dry or near-dry. Due to recent increased rainfall there is more water in Lake George this year. Therefore, as part of the statement of commitments, 14b (iii), there will be a pre-construction</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>biodiversity survey which will include the waterfowl.</p> <p>It is noted that the historic shore of Lake George could be as close as 200m from the closest component of the project; however, this edge is very seldom the edge of the actual water body. The distance between the towers and the water body will be much greater than 200 metres.</p>	
<p>Submission Nine – Palerang Council dated 7 February 2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proponent will negotiate with the Council's General Manager about the appropriate project in which to direct the community contribution. The amount of contribution is in line with previous generous contributions made and the Proponent cannot commit to additional funding at the risk of the project becoming uneconomical. • The proponent will commit to bitumen seal the 400m section of road between 3.00 – 3.40 km from Taylors Creek Road where there are 2 houses close to the road. • Western Leg road is adequately designed and suitable for construction as shown by the construction of the existing Capital wind farm. The proponent will complete pre and post dilapidation reports as required and amend any impacts from the construction of CWFII. • The Proponent has committed to provide up to a maximum of \$100,000 to go towards improving the biodiversity values, which will be negotiated with the involved landowners. • CWF II has been assessed as an independent project, though taking into account the cumulative impacts of the existing wind farms. There is no reason that the consent should be withheld due to perceived issues with other projects. • The CEMP will provide additional commitments to ensure that the site is managed in order to reduce the spread of weeds. 	<p>Statement of Commitments 11c</p> <p>Statement of Commitments 14e</p>
<p>Submission Ten – Department of Industry & Investment dated 8 February 2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed project will comply with the requirements of the <i>Fisheries Management Act 1994</i> and associated <i>Policy and Guidelines for Aquatic Habitat Management and Fish Conservation (1999)</i>. • The design and construction of any new or upgraded track crossings of Taylors Creek or Butmarro Creek will be undertaken in accordance with I&I NSW's <i>Policy and Guidelines for Fish</i> 	<p>Statement of Commitments 15j</p>

	<p><i>Friendly Waterway Crossings (2004) and Why Do Fish Need to Cross the Road.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponent rejects the idea that the potential sand and gravel resource may be sterilised by the wind turbines. The actual land area required for wind turbines is only approximately 1% of the site. Further, the Proponent rejects the logic that one high value economic activity (capturing the wind resource and converting this to electricity) should be sterilised in order to protect another activity that to date has not undergone any environmental, planning or detailed resource assessment. 	
Submission Eleven – Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent has considered the duty of care and determined that obstacle lighting would be inappropriate and unsafe. Lighting may introduce a new hazard at this site as the proposed site is below the tops of the adjacent unlit hills; therefore, lighting the towers would create the illusion that the lower towers are the highest obstacles that need to be avoided. As such no lighting will be installed. 	EA Chapter 12
Department of Planning - comments dated 24 February 2011 (Attachment B - Flora and Fauna)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated Table 6 on page 81 of Volume One of the Environmental Assessment. Revised statement of commitment 14b) iv. Revised statement of commitment 14b) v. Potential blade strike was addressed in the Flora and Fauna Assessment in Volume Two, Appendix D, Section 6.5. No large flocks of birds have been seen on or flying over the Capital Wind Farm site during several years of observations by KMA, therefore, it is expected that no significant impact to bird movements will occur due to the location of the proposed turbines. The infrastructure from the preferred layout in Attachment F of this submissions report that have the potential to impact native grassland has a total area of 0.98 hectares. As per the revised Statement of Commitments, there will be a pre-construction survey to determine the final area of native grassland impacted and an offset with a ratio of 10:1 will be implemented. 	<p>Submissions Report Attachment C</p> <p>Submissions Report Attachment A</p> <p>Submissions Report Attachment A</p> <p>Statement of Commitments 14b(iv)</p>
Public Submissions		
Submission Two – Mr William Hoorweg dated 31 January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive flora and fauna assessment has been completed and it has been determined that the proposal will not have a significant impact upon the threatened species or communities listed in the Environmental Assessment. 	EA Chapter 9 & Appendix D

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No large flocks of birds have been seen on or flying over the Capital Wind Farm site during several years of observations by KMA, therefore, it is expected that no significant impact to bird movements will occur due to the location of the proposed turbines. A comprehensive visual assessment has been completed and it has determined that the proposal will visually integrate into the landscape resulting in an acceptable visual impact on the existing landscape character and amenity. 	<p>EA Appendix D</p> <p>EA Chapter 7 & Appendix A</p>
Submission Four – Mr Paul Salisbury dated 6 February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beacons. Capital II Wind Farm is located well outside the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) of any airport and therefore is outside of CASA's area of interest and authority. Further, as the wind farm is outside of an OLS, it does not pose a hazard to aviation and will not have beacons installed. 	EA Chapter 12
Submission Five – Mr Peter Taft dated 7 February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital II Wind Farm is not located in close proximity to Tarago Road and would have no impact on land available for housing on this road. It is also noted that releasing land on Tarago Road for housing would be contrary to the Sydney-Canberra Corridor Strategy. Employment opportunities in the area are in addition to the direct employment during construction and operation. The increase in commercial activity through services such as accommodation, vehicle maintenance, hardware, refuelling, and food outlets will benefit by the additional personnel in the area. This is supported by recent comments made by the acting president, Andrew Riley, of the Bungendore Chamber of Commerce and Industry when asked about the economic impact of the recently approved Capital Solar Farm, "If it's as successful in stimulating local business as when the wind farm was being constructed and there's no reason to expect it wouldn't be, that's great news." The Proponent has had a community open day, and has recently sponsored and been involved in the following community events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tarago School Car Boot sale; Tarago Primary School Show; The Tarago Show – Major sponsor of the tug of war contest; 	<p>EA Chapter 15</p> <p>EA Chapter 15</p> <p>EA Chapter 6</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rotary Bungendore/Lake George Harvest Festival – Gold Sponsor; and ○ Lake George Winds of Change Festival – Major Sponsor. • The Proponent would welcome an invitation to join the Bungendore Chamber of Commerce. Various offers to speak to the Chamber have been made in previous years and it is noted that the Chamber is very supportive of Capital Wind Farm (see above). • The solar energy project open day was held on the 30th of July 2010 in the War Memorial Hall in Bungendore. The open day was advertised in the local newspapers and on local radio. • The long term annual average for the existing Capital Wind Farm is in excess of 440 gigawatt hours of electricity annually. This is enough electricity to power 60,700 homes annually (based on an average NSW household electricity consumption). This equates to saving approximately 3.5 million tonnes of green house gases emissions by 2020 (estimated using the Clean Energy Council's method of calculating greenhouse gas reduction from wind farms.) • Capital II Wind Farm is estimated to produce 314 gigawatt hours of electricity annually, which is enough to power 43,100 homes annually and will save 2.5 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2020. • Capital II Wind Farm was designed to take advantage of existing electrical infrastructure, saving the need to build new transmission lines thereby reducing the network energy losses. The marginal loss factor determined by the Australian Energy Market Operator in this area is positive, which demonstrates that there is currently an economic requirement for more generation on the 330kV transmission line to which the Capital II Wind Farm will connect. • At the end of Capital II Wind Farm's economic life, the components will either be replaced with new equipment or decommissioned. It is expected that this will be after 25 years of operation. Decommissioning will involve dismantling and removal of all above ground elements and site rehabilitation. 	EA Chapter 3
Submission Six – Ms Sue Corrigan dated 7 February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing Capital wind farm has a greater visual presence to the area on Taylors Creek Road residences and therefore the more distant proposed wind turbines are unlikely to impact significantly on the landscape character. 	EA Chapter 7 & Appendix A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shadow Flicker has been assessed and there is no impact on the residence from the CWFII proposed project, as the location of the residence is outside the area predicted to be affected by shadow flicker which can be seen in Figure 67 of Volume One of the EA, residence number G16. The noise assessment has been completed for a worst case predicted noise scenario and has found the predicted noise levels at the residence is significantly below the criteria set by the NSW DECCW. The subject residence was identified as a relevant receiver known as G16. The Environmental Noise Guidelines prepared by the South Australian Environmental Protection Authority state that the maximum equivalent noise should not exceed 35dba at all relevant receivers. The maximum predicted noise level at the residence for all wind speeds is well below the maximum 35dBA (Table 7-4 Appendix C). These calculations also considered the existing noise generated from CWFI and the predicted noise level from the Woodlawn Wind Farm; therefore the maximum possible background noise level was considered. Furthermore, the background noise monitoring results were carried out prior to the construction and operation of CWFI, which is the worst case scenario. Due to the location of the proposed CWFII there will be no adverse effects of silt into the discussed tributary of Taylors Creek. In addition, the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will put in place a process to ensure no sediment enters into Lake George. A comprehensive flora and fauna assessment has been completed and it has been determined that the proposal will not have a significant impact upon the threatened species or communities listed in the Environmental Assessment. Specifically, no large flocks of birds have been seen on or flying over the Capital Wind Farm site during several years of observations by KMA, therefore, it is expected that no significant impact to bird movements will occur due to the location of the proposed turbines. A comprehensive Aboriginal Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment has been completed and the Proponent has realigned some infrastructure to avoid impacting the aboriginal 	<p>EA Chapter 7 & Appendix B</p> <p>EA Chapter 8 & Appendix C</p> <p>Statement of Commitments 15 & 22</p> <p>EA Chapter 9 & Appendix D</p> <p>EA Chapter 10 & Appendix F</p>
--	---	--

	<p>sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A community open day was held on the 8th of September and Ms Corrigan was personally notified. A meeting was held at her residence on the 7th of September where further information was provided. In addition, an offer of planting additional trees was made; however, Ms Corrigan expressed satisfaction at the current landscaping. 	EA Chapter 6
Submission Twelve – Ruth Corrigan dated 14 March 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise. The noise assessment has been completed for a worst case predicted noise scenario (assuming a 55 WTG layout) and has found the predicted noise levels at the residence (identified as G11 in Appendix C) is significantly below the criteria set by the NSW Department of Planning Director General Requirements during both the construction and operation period. This information is provided in the independent noise specialist report in Appendix C of the Environmental Assessment which is publically available. Further, this noise report assumed a 55 WTG layout, whereas the Proponents preferred layout now restricts this layout to 41 WTGs. Bird life. A comprehensive flora and fauna report was prepared based on extensive survey work undertaken throughout the subject site; these results were supplemented by surveys over several previous years. The report concluded that the proposal would not have a significant impact on any threatened species of flora and fauna; including the species listed in the submission. The submission refers to numerous bird species, however, all of which except the Osprey are not listed as threatened or vulnerable under the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. The flora and fauna assessment considered all species groups listed in the submission (e.g. water birds and birds of prey). Furthermore, it is unlikely, or rarely, that Ospreys would be present in the area of Lake George or within the subject site as Osprey's favour coastal areas. Nests are made high up in dead trees or in dead crowns of live trees, usually within one kilometre of the sea. As such, it is extremely unlikely that a population of Ospreys would be inhabit areas adjacent to Lake George, including the subject site. The proposed wind turbine locations are greater than 200m away from the edge of Lake George. Figure 4 identifies a 200m buffer zone from the edge of Lake George. The 	<p>EA Chapter 8 & Appendix C</p> <p>SOC 14c</p>

	<p>report notes that birds of prey inhabit the area, but are in low numbers and some birds were observed to fly around the turbines without any negative impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Temperate Grassland. The proposed layout has been adjusted to minimise the impact to any potential native grassland and if any native grassland should be shown to be impacted during the preconstruction survey, conservation measures will be undertaken on the remainder of the patch and/or other patches on-site at a ratio of 10 to 1. This matter has been discussed with DECCW. • Aboriginal Survey. A comprehensive Aboriginal survey has been conducted by Austral Archaeology; a company with extensive experience in assessing indigenous heritage; for the entire site of the proposed wind farm. Several objects of significance were located, however, the preferred project has been design to avoid all recorded objects and sites of potential archaeological significance. If additional un-recorded Aboriginal archaeological material is encountered during construction, works will cease within 100m of the site to allow further investigation and recording. • Palynology. The proposal will not impact the bed of Lake George and the proponent does not intend to fund further research in this area. 	<p>SOC 14b(iv)</p> <p>SOC 16a</p>
--	---	-----------------------------------