

18th December 2007

Dear Sir / Madam

RE: Planning Focus Meeting, Silverton Wind Farm, 14th and 15th November 2007

Thank you for attending the Planning Focus Meeting for the proposed Silverton Wind Farm.

The attached final minutes have been sent to all participating agencies and amended as appropriate to ensure that the comments noted are accurate and in context; changes were made to the DECC and Broken Hill City Council comments only.

As discussed, these minutes are intended to 'kick-off' agency consultation. You will have further opportunity to provide comments to the Department of Planning after the Project Application for this proposal has been lodged.

If you would like to pass further comments on to the Department of Planning directly, please contact Neville Osborne neville.osborne@planning.nsw.gov.au.

Thank you again for your participation which will assist in the thorough assessment of the proposal.

Yours sincerely



Tim Browne

Project Officer, nghenvironmental

nghenvironmental
www.nghenvironmental.com.au

Participants included:

- Neville Osborne, Department of Planning
- Daniel Stokes and Andrew Bell, Department of Lands
- Harvey Johnson, Mark Fletcher and Dennis Harvey, Department of Environment and Climate Change
- Robert Barnes, Department of Primary Industries
- Louise Turner, Western Catchment Management Authority
- Noel Hayward and Claire Wilkinson, Lower Murray Darling Catchment Management Authority
- Frank Zaknich and Peter Oldsen, Broken Hill City Council
- Adrian Ray, Country Energy
- Joe Sulicich, Roads and Traffic Authority
- David Trethewey, Transgrid
- Rodger Ubrihien and John Coman, Bega Duo Designs
- Madeline Cowley, Donna Bolton and Simon Davey, Epuron
- Nick Graham-Higgs and Tim Browne, **ngh**environmental

Meeting format

Participants met in Broken Hill on the 14th of November 2007 where a presentation on the proposal was given. Participants were transported to the site via the Mundi Mundi lookout, where the general location of the proposed site was identified to the participants. The participants then proceeded to the site of the wind monitoring tower. During this stop, Archaeologist, Julie Dibden gave a brief presentation on the archaeological investigations that had been completed to date. On the following day, the participants were taken to another portion of the site accessed from the Daydream Mine road. Due to the size of the proposal site it was considered impracticable to attempt to see a large portion of the site in detail. As such, the site inspections were concentrated in areas of the proposed stage one works. Additionally, an attempt was made to have inspections on ridge tops to facilitate extended views of the site. At each stop, Madeline Cowley gave an overview of likely infrastructure placement. The number of turbines and their placement will not be decided until after the results of specialist studies are known. Nick Graham-Higgs described the Part 3A assessment process, under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, and the purpose of the Planning Focus Meeting.

Agency representatives were given time to ask questions and raise key concerns that they may have regarding the proposal. Key issues that arose are indicated below.

Comments from participants:

Agency	Issues raised
Department of Planning	<p>The Department of Planning representative, Neville Osborne raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability of the proposal and links to NRET scheme. Epuron responded that the viability of the proposal was dependent on renewable energy schemes such as NRET • Potential socio-economic impacts
Department of Environment and Climate Change	<p>DECC Archaeologist Harvey Johnston raised the following issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sought clarification on whether Epuron was looking at the archaeological impacts of all three stages of the wind farm? Archaeologist Julie Dibden indicated that the Archaeological study at this stage of the project was focussed on the area subject to stage one works. <p>DECC Representative Dennis Harvey raised the following issues:</p> <p>Based on information provided the proposal is likely to be considered a scheduled activity under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act) as an electrical generation facility and as such the proposal would require an environmental protection licence from the DECC, to regulate the construction and operational phases of the development. DoP development consent is only being sought for stage one of the development (and concept approval for stages two and three). As a result of this a licence can only be issued initially for stage one works with the application for additional licences amendments for stage two and stage three sought at a later date after development approval had been issued for the latter stages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The noise assessment should be based on the South Australian published noise guidelines for wind farm developments. The earlier briefing indicated that several residences would be subjected to noise levels above the guideline levels. Also one of these residents was not part of the proposed development to have wind generators constructed on his land. In cases where the guideline noise level will be exceeded the proponent would need to have written agreement with the occupants of this adverse noise impact. It will obviously be much easier to facilitate such an agreement if the landholder is part of the scheme to have generators on his property. If such an agreement is not made the guideline noise level will have to be achieved at the residences. • The siting of the concrete batching plant should be appropriately assessed. There is likely to be a licence required for the batching plant itself. A licence is required if the production rate of the batching plant is greater than 30,000 tonnes per year. If the concrete batching plant is situated within the electricity generation facility it will be regulated for the purposes of the POEO Act by DECC, regardless of the production rate. If the plant is located outside the electricity generation facility and has a production rate greater than 30,000 tonnes per year it will require a separate environment protection licence and be regulated by DECC. If the plant is located outside the facility, and below the above production rate, it will be regulated for the purposes of the POEO Act by Western Lands. • The proponent will need to apply for and obtain all necessary licences prior to the commencement of the construction phase of the proposal. • The access roads that are located within a licensed premises will need appropriate erosion and sediment control plans, which should be assessed as part of the Environmental assessment. • The sourcing of materials for the batching plant will need to be identified
Western CMA	<p>Western CMA representative, Louise Turner enquired about the socio-economic impacts during construction. Louise was interested if there would a construction camp planned for Silverton or were construction workers going to be based in Broken Hill.</p>

Agency	Issues raised
Lower Murray Darling CMA	<p>Lower Murray Darling CMA representatives, Noel Hayward and Claire Wilkinson raised the following issue with regards to the wind farm turbine site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential erosion and sedimentation of creeks as a result of the wind farm, and had buffering of creeks been considered. <p>Additionally, regarding the proposed powerline route between Broken Hill and Red Cliffs the following issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is at least one property located along the proposed route that is subject to a property vegetation plan • Potential flora and fauna impacts • Potential cultural heritage impacts • That landholders be treated equitably throughout the process.
Department of Lands	<p>The Department of Lands representative Andrew Bell raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land tenure in relation to the wind farm is yet to be determined. • The level of disturbance as a result of construction across the site. • The location and the nature of the access tracks. Dust, erosion and sediment control associated with the monitoring towers and the access tracks. • The apparent level of degradation of the land. • Land tenure issues and approach with regards to the powerlines. In addition, the potential powerline structure design was also raised. • There maybe a requirement to produce a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) for the future construction and maintenance of proposed monitoring masts and associated access tracks. • Is there a requirement to contact the traditional owners of the land and if so have the traditional owners been contacted? Epuron advised that the Aboriginal Land Council in Broken Hill had been contacted
Country Energy	<p>Country Energy representative Adrian Rae, enquired about the potential need for additional power to the site during the construction phase of the proposal. Additionally, Country Energy indicated that Country Water would likely be concerned with the potential impacts on the Umberumberka Reservoir.</p> <p>There was also a concern about the effects on power supply to Silverton from 120 Operations and maintenance jobs if a significant portion of these workers lived in Silverton.</p>
Department of Primary Industries (Minerals)	<p>Robert Barnes of DPI raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the potential for future mineral exploration was not adversely affected. The DPI are concerned that the exploration industry maybe precluded from the development area of the wind farm. • The potential heritage significance of any historic mine sites.
Roads and Traffic Authority	<p>The Roads and Traffic Authority representative Joe Sulicich commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • careful consideration would have to be undertaken when identifying the route for infrastructure to be transported to site. • infrastructure of this size would need to consider factors such as bridges, widths, heights etc.
Broken Hill City Council	<p>Representatives of the Broken Hill City Council, Frank Zaknich and Peter Oldsen, raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impacts with the increased workers primarily during construction • The cumulative impact of the proposal on the Broken Hill LGA and Silverton including economic and community

Agency	Issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="394 253 856 280">• Powerline visibility from the sculpture park

Comments from agencies unable to attend the PFM:

Agency	Comments
Defence	<p>Flight Safety – will the site of the wind farm have any affect on the safety of military flying operations?</p> <p>Communications – are there any Defence line-of-sight communications such as microwave link paths passing through the wind farm site?</p> <p>Defence radars – is the proposed wind farm site in proximity to a Defence radar?</p> <p>Please keep Defence informed of the proposal. When do you expect that Defence would be requested to formally provide comment?</p>
CASA	<p>CASA has an interest in tall structures which could be hazardous to aircraft. Under existing legislation, a person who proposes to construct a building or structure, the top of which will be 110 metres or more above ground level, is required to notify CASA of such development. CASA referred to the Civil Aviation Safety Authority Advisory Publication AC-139-18(0) – Obstacle marking and Lighting for Wind Farms. This publication provides CASA's requirements in respect to wind farms. CASA notes that the Broken Hill aerodrome is the nearest Aerodrome and the Silverton proposal appears to be well beyond the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces distance of 1500 metres. In addition, CASA note that both Mildura and Wentworth aerodromes are located in the vicinity of the proposed Buronga and Red Cliffs sites and as such OLS clearance requirements will need to be observed. In addition, aerodromes that are neither certified or registered aerodromes under the jurisdiction of CASA regulations are known as Aeroplane landing areas and further information can be found at www.casa.gov.au/download/CAAPs/ops/92_1.pdf.</p>
Country Water	<p>Country Water raised the issue regarding the legislative requirements for Umberumberka Reservoir. Country Water confirmed that they are happy to consider assessment process under the Part 3A process. nghenvironmental confirmed that necessary legislative requirements relating to the Umberumberka reservoir would be assessed as part of the Environmental Assessment report.</p>
Department of Environment and Climate Change	<p>Mr Peter Ewin from the DECC was unable to attend the Planning Focus Meeting; however nghenvironmental arranged a subsequent meeting on site to discuss issues specifically relating to flora and fauna. Mr Ewin raised the following three main issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential of bird strike and the potential to review siting of turbines to reduce the bird strike • The potential to look at strategies to improve the management of area with specific reference to goats • The need to appropriately manage potential habitats for the endangered species found in the area, notably Spinifex grasses and rocky outcrops.
Wentworth Shire Council	<p>Wentworth Shire Council declined an invitation to attend the planning focus meeting, however asked that be updated with progress regarding the proposal.</p>