

Supplementary
Submission
No 38d

INQUIRY INTO RURAL WIND FARMS

Name: Mr Keith Thompson

Date received: 12/10/2009

Keith Thompson,

7th October 2009,

The Director,
General Purpose Standing Committee No. 5,
Parliament House,
Sydney. NSW. 2000.

Dear Director,

Reference; Inquiry into Rural Wind Farms.

I enclose a copy of a letter to the Dept of Planning, complaining as to the treatment of our questions to themselves.

These questions have been passed onto the proponent 'Pamada Pty. Ltd.,' to answer, for the answers to be published to the public. Upon reading I found that my questions were rearranged, as I have said in this attached letter.

I thought you should have a copy before the meeting day in Tamworth, so that if the Committee have questions they can be asked with reading before hand.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Keith Thompson". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the typed name.

Keith Thompson. J.P. nsw

Keith Thompson,

4th October 2009.

Director-General,
Major Infrastructure Assessment,
Department of Planning,
GPO Box 39,
Sydney. NSW. 2001.

Dear Director/Ms McKenzie,

Ref; MP 06 0055, Pamada Pty. Ltd., Kyoto Industrial Energy Park Scone.

Thank you for your response to my email dated 28th September 2009, Re; the reference numbers from the 'Responses to the Public Submissions', dated August 2009, My number is No.25 and a such can only find that number **12 times** in the 89 pages. So where are the other answers to my questions? I list the Submission Number and the number of questions in each;

Email 23 June 2009, has 1 question,
Submission 1, has 3 questions,
Submission 2, has 21 questions,
Submission 3, has 3 questions,
Submission 4, has 17 questions,
Submission 5, has 2 Questions,
Letter Dated 12th August 2009 has 1 question.

Total 48 questions

I find where reference No. 25 is listed on pages 39-65 that these questions are not my questions, questions not in my words or my questions have been altered. Do you, the Dept of Planning allow these questions to be altered?

Examples:

- 2. Project Description. No.4. This is not my question, but a No. 25 is in the reference column.
- 3. Project Development Phases. No.11.
My question as in Submission No. 4, Question No.14,

Length of Completion time.

After the Dept of Planning has given the approval (I know the Director General and the Minister etc give the approval but), does the proponent have to complete the full industrial development. I mean from official approval date how many months do you give them to full complete the development, say 36 months???

Pamada has altered the question and answered, No11;

12. How many months will it take after approval is gained to complete the development?

13. The EA is not the final document to be submitted. There is a lot of missing final design details. When will final design documents be made available along with management plans for traffic, construction and environmental monitoring?

The Development timeframe includes the final design period and electrical connection agreement (approximately 7-11 months) and construction works program (approximately 20 months duration). The final design stage shall include design of civil and electrical works and preparation of tenders and contracts prior to construction works. It is likely that an EPC contract (Engineering, Procurement and Construction or turnkey) be awarded for the project. Section 3.4 of the EA outlines the Development Timeframe for the project subject to receipt of approval from the Minister.

My response to their answer;

Does not give a definite full and final completion time of HOW MANY MONTHS are allowed for completion by the DoP.

- **6.4 Mitigation of greenhouse gasses. No.16.**

My question as in Submission No. 1, Question No.3,

*My next concern is the use of the Concrete (cement), the type that has been used in Australia for a large number of years is 'PORTLAND' cement, and this form of cement is a large contributor of Carbon Dioxide into the atmosphere, as One Tonne of Portland Cement places approximately ONE tonne of CO2 into our atmosphere. There are studies into the use of '**Low-Calcium Fly Ash Geopolymer Concrete**', with the effects of very good qualities for its use in the construction of this GREEN Industrial Energy Park. This Fly ash is readily available at our coal powered power stations, and is very economically priced.*

I give you references; 'Curtin University of Technology', 'Walloh, S.E. and Rangan, B.V. (2006) LOW-CALCIUM FLY ASH-BASED GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE: LONG-TERM PROPERTIES. Technical Report no. GC2, Curtin University of Technology, Faculty of Engineering. (<http://espace.lis.curtin.edu.au/archive/00000842>).

Additional references: Professor B, Vijaya Rangan. BE PhD FIE Aust also FACI, CPEng, Emeritus Professor of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Curtin.....Geopolymer Institute (<http://www.geopolymer.org/applications/geopolymer-cement. Also Cement2>).

I hope I have given you sufficient references to assure you that 'Portland' Cement must NOT be used in ANY constructions in these Industrial Energy Park areas at Scone:

Pamada has altered the question and answered, No16;

6.4 Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases (GHG)

17. Life cycle analysis is not clear on the energy and carbon dioxide involved in the development when considering environmental benefits of the project. Please provide more information on this and expected energy payback. Please include carbon intensity of producing the Portland cement or other cement planned to be used. Consider transport of international parts and steel fabrication and creation.

The Energy Payback period is described in Section 6.4.7 of Volume 1 of the EA. The Energy Payback period for an installed wind turbine generator (Vestas 3MW) has been estimated at 5-6 months. The Energy Payback period for the Solar PV plant (fixed array) has been estimated at 12-13 months. The embodied energy (the energy required to manufacture and install the generator component to the point of use) includes concrete (i.e. cement), fabrication and transportation.

My response to their answer;

Greenhouse gasses and payback are mentioned but not a thing about '**Low-Calcium Fly Ash Geopolymer Concrete**'. Again my question has been changed and the response has nothing to do with the green type cement.

- **8. Biodiversity, flora and fauna No.32.**

My question as in Submission No. 4, Question No.15,

Birds.

The only comment that I have is, in the last approval of a wind farm a condition was that each death of a particular bird a fine was imposed, but for such a small amount of money. The amount should be ten times that amount to a minimum of A\$15,000 each bird.

Pamada has altered the question and answered No. 32;

8.0 Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna

32. How dangerous are Wind Farms to the Wedge Tail eagle? What is the likely occurrence of bird strikes? It has been stated they will be decimated.

Wedge-tail eagles have been sighted on the Middlebrook and Mountain station sites and in the surrounds. These occur at low density on both sites as they are higher order predators with specific home ranges. Wedge-tailed eagles were observed across both sites soaring at RSA height, close to the ground and soaring above the ridges searching for food. Nesting activity was observed at the northern end of Middlebrook Station. It is considered likely that a pair of Wedge-tailed eagles occupy a home territory at Middlebrook Station, with a separate pair at Mountain Station. Despite low population numbers across the site, Wedge-tail eagles were considered to be at moderate risk of collision with turbine blades as their home ranges are located within the airspace of a wind farm. There is still however considered a moderate risk of blade collision and hence the Wedge Tail eagle is a "species of concern" requiring Level 3 Assessment in accordance with *Auswind Wind Farms and Birds: Interim Standards for Risk Assessment*. A total of 13 turbines have been omitted from the original proposal. This includes a total of 4 turbines from the original turbine layout on Mountain Station and 9 turbines from Middlebrook Station in closest proximity to the Towarr National Park, limiting the potential for collision with both the Wedge-tailed Eagle and the Nankeen Kestrel. As noted above, the wind turbines are not expected to result in significant blade strike impacts to local wedge-tailed eagles and the Nankeen Kestrel, including young birds. This is based on the experiences at other wind farm sites in Australia, where wind farms are present within eagle home ranges. Low expected mortality rates are not considered to be a threat to local population numbers. The Environmental Management Plan will include a pre-operational and operational Adaptive Management Plan in accordance with Auswind guidelines, include monitoring of 'species of concern' identified on both sites including the Wedge-tailed eagle and the Nankeen Kestrel. **33.**

My response to their answer; You should keep the fines large thereby making sure that all these birds are looked after. If Pamada feels that there are low possibilities of bird strike, then let them accept a high fine of \$15,000 for each bird or are they worried that a lot of these birds will be killed.

- **6.6 Socio-Economic Impacts No. 25**

My question as in Submission No. 1, Question No.2.

"The two Mr Marks sat in my Home in May 2006 and said that the Managers Residence will not be needed as there will only be 2 casual maintained staff needed. Yes CASUAL STAFF, not the 15 + that is stated in this document. I understand that the construction stages will need a lot of people working but there are no figures to say just how many are going to be employed or contracted from the SCONE Township. Most of the construction work force will be from outside of our SCONE

Township..... There are already rumours that a workforce is at the ready to get into construction, from South Australia, ready to get onto the pre-erecting stage. So could I have some figures, with details, as to where these construction jobs are coming from? It would be helpful information as to where the out of town workforce will be accommodated.

Pamada has altered the question and answered No. 25;

26. Please provide more information on actual jobs created by the operation and construction of the wind farm.

The Kyoto Energy Park proposal creates the opportunity to establish a sustainable energy market and provide renewable energy to regional electricity markets. Furthermore, it creates the opportunity to contribute to state-wide greenhouse reduction and renewable energy targets, whilst promoting long-term environmental benefits and increased economic activity within the region. The investment of considerable funds during the construction and establishment of the Kyoto Energy Park will contribute to the creation of employment across a range of industries including construction, transport and manufacturing sectors. The most significant economic component of the project will be during the manufacturing and construction phase. The total expected capital expenditure for the project is between 140 and 190 million dollars depending on the final Kyoto Energy Park overall capacity. It is estimated that the proportion of expenditure that may be captured domestically is in the order of 82 to 122 million dollars, representing a proportion of approximately 60% of total expenditure. The domestic proportion of capture of this expenditure may grow by the time the project is commenced if a higher proportion of components can be sourced within Australia. Scone has a low unemployment rate (currently around 4% or close to full employment), which combined with a high participation rate of 62.2% may indicate a labor market operating at, or near capacity. It may therefore be the case that additional specialists may need to relocate to Scone for a time to fulfill some positions related to this project. Additional workers to the area will positively impact on local businesses, through an increase in customers and clients.

My response to their answer;

Pamada have side stepped my question again. Can you get them to answer my questions instead of these drawn out explanations that do not give me the answer to my question?

• **10. Noise Impact NO.56.**

My question as in Submission No. 2, Question No.3 &4 &6 &7 &8 &9 &10 &11 &12 &13 &14 &15 &16 &17 &18 &19 &20.

also Submission No. 4, Question No.13 &16,

also Submission No. 5, Question No.2,

also Letter dated 12th August 2009, Question No.1.

Submission No. 2, Question No.3

"Noise.

Once again on page 3 of the Noise report (No. 07038), we get words "The assessment of noise from wind farms requires more detailed consideration". When are we, the Public, going to see the EXACT DETAILS of these proposals????"

Submission No. 2, Question No.4.

"Mr Mark Dixon has told us at the beginning of 2009 that our AVERAGE day & night times readings for our home ("PeakHill", yes just over 1km from our home, not our boundary) is 25dB(A), this is not in writing but at that time we believed what he told us. Now I read that the "Sound Power Levels" will be 100.4dB(A) at the front of each turbine, this means that being only a short distance to our home that we will receive a lot heavier dose of NOISE than the 25dB(A) we have at the present. We feel that the Dept of Planning should be looking after OUR position near to these 5 turbines (Nos. 27,28,29,30,31). We can't see how the Proponents can possible keep the noise, and I

mean NOISE, down to the present levels (that's 25dB(A)) to keep our living conditions that we have today."

Submission No. 2, Question No.6.

"On page 6 item 3 "Surrounding Residential Receivers" (last part of the page) "Residences are located to the east, etc of Mountain Station...are all more than 1km from the nearest turbine....Well that maybe correct as the positions are on these papers but as I note in the Mini placements of these turbines we may have one or more within that 1km. This was also confirmed by Mr Mark Dixon on his last visit to our home, only a couple of weeks ago. The allowable movement, because of rock formations in a position, will need to be an allowable movement of about 150 meters in any direction, therefore the turbines could come EAST, therefore closer to our home, then we would find out later when the turbines are in place and too late to move them. So how do we ask you to **not** allow the 5 turbines above our home (Nos. 27,28,29,30,31.), and as an alternative have that area completely covered with Solar, and scrap the 5 turbines."

Submission No. 2, Question No.7.

"Page 12 of the Noise report, Figure 4-2, could you have the proponent (or the writer of the report) fully explain this wind speed vs. background noise-"PeakHill", into plain English for us???"

Submission No. 2, Question No.8.

"We notice in several of the readings of dB(A)'s that "PeakHill" is registered as 26dB(A) (Page 18, Table 4-2 Nighttime), then I read on and it says in 5.1 Operational Noise Level Criteria, that the SA guide lines say 35dB(A) plus 5 dB(A) is allowed. I am amazed that any body can OK the increase in NOISE in our part of our State to this high level when we have been living in this Beautiful, Peaceful and Quiet place for the past 41/2 years. Now YOU want to damage this quite place with this **Industrial NOISE.**"

Submission No. 2, Question No.9.

"Again with the 26dB(A), We are even more concerned that these other figures are for ONE only turbine, what is the cumulative effect, perhaps the proponent can explain in plain English for us to read, and to satisfy you (Dept of Planning) that the noise level should NOT go any higher than it is today (25dB(A))."

Submission No. 2, Question No.10.

"Just one comment that I would like you to take into account, "WHY SHOULD WE HEAR THEM, AS WE DON'T HEAR THAT SORT OF NOISE NOW, WHY SHOULD WE WHEN THEY ARE BUILT?"

Submission No. 2, Question No.11.

"5.2 Page 20 'the Mini Hydro, Solar PV and Ancillary Items,' I note that the 'Noise Contribution of 25dB(A)' is acceptable, but what is the cumulative effect combined with the 5 turbines above our "PeakHill"???"

Submission No. 2, Question No.12.

"6.1 Page 21 Modulation, If this (as is explained in the fourth part down) happens, WHO do we call to have this stopped or at least stop the 5 Turbines above our home???"

Submission No. 2, Question No.13.

"6.2 Page 23 'Wind Farmer' noise prediction, does this program tell us information about the dB(C) Vibration effect???"

Submission No. 2, Question No.14.

"Table 6-2 Page 24, Could the proponent explain in plain English about this table and its effect as to our property "PeakHill"?"

Submission No. 2, Question No.15.

"Table 6-3 Page 25, Could the proponent explain the effects on our home "PeakHill" as we cannot understand how predictions can be above today's readings of 25dB(A)'s.

Submission No. 2, Question No.16.

"Page 27, Location "PeakHill", the second part, we will not accept an increase of 31% in noise at winter time. By the way, we weren't asked about our living habits, as we do leave our windows open during the winter and summer at night, as we have 5 cats and 3 dogs that come and go from the doors as well at night, Winter and Summer."

Submission No. 2, Question No.17.

"Also page 27, fifth passage down, the proponent will need to explain this sentence in plain English as well, as I think it means that we need a set back of the wind turbines of at least 3km from our HOME, because of the possible errors built into the modelling system??"

Submission No. 2, Question No.18.

"7.1.1. Page 27, Noise Management Plan, I thought this part of the EA was the end result, but as I have pointed out before, the EA is so empty of DETAILED and EXACTING details that I will be amazed if the Dept of Planning approve it at all. I hope you ask for exact details of all of these Management plans and distribute them to all of us that have asked for these details, and then we will have the time to go through them and give our opinion."

Submission No. 2, Question No.19.

"7.4 Page 29, The distance of our property "PeakHill" is closer than that printed here, if the turbines are just over 1km from our home and they are set back from the ridge line, then as the solar is rite on the ridge line then the Solar is underneath turbines No.27, 28 & 29, it seems that the Solar is closer than 1km from our home, please ask the proponent to give exact measurements from the north and south points, that's on the east and from our Home."

Submission No. 2, Question No.20.

"10. Page 37, I note in the eighth paragraph that it is proposed to have PERMANENT monitoring at our Home "PeakHill". I assume that that will be discussed with us by the proponent not long after the approval and conditions are applied to them???"

Submission No. 4, Question No.13.

***"Managers Residence.** I notice that the Managers Residence is to be situated near to turbine No 20, this seems to be very close to each other. If we ("PeakHill") are just over 1km from some Turbines then the Managers Residence will be what, 150-200 meters from the turbine No 20, this will not be within the tolerance range for NOISE. The reports show us that the dB(A) readings are 104dB(A) at the turbine, so what will*

the residence of the Managers Resident have to put up with, that is if the proponent ever intended to build a Managers Residence, especially as there are only going to be 2 casual employees working there and that ALL turbines will be able to be controlled off site.”

Submission No. 4, Question No.16.

“Noise Disturbance. (Key Insights, 4.1.3 CD page 777)

I reprint a portion of a letter I have sent to the Upper Hunter Shire Council, re Noise Disturbance;

“3rd July 2009.

The General Manager,
Upper Hunter Shire Council,
Liverpool Street,
Scone. NSW. 2337.

Dear Sir,

Re; The ‘EA’ for the Industrial Energy Park, Scone.

Noise... There will be noise disturbances from the Industrial Wind Turbines. Mr Mark Dixon, at our home, drew a diagram to show the dB(A) readings of 100dB(A) at the front of each of the 5 turbines nearest to our home (they are to be just over 1km from our home, not our boundary fence) and the noise level at our home he expects to be 35dB(A) plus 5dB(A). But as we pointed out to him the average reading at our home by the monitors (also confirmed by Mr Mark Dixon), that’s the day and night, is 25dB(A). So, whom do we write to in Council and the Police to have the disturbance noise STOPPED?”

Last Question today, when the final, exact plans, final exact details, are finally done do I get to see these details, as I would like to check them as I don’t want the changes to be detrimental to ourselves or our property “PeakHill”.

Yours Sincerely,

Keith Thompson. J.P. nsw.”

Submission No. 5, Question No.2.

“Last question, I downloaded a page from the web about **‘SEPP 33, Hazardous and offensive Developments’**, I am looking at this as an example of the Industrial Development that is proposed to be built on Mountain and Middlebrook Stations. Mountain Station is the one site that I am concerned about as it is just above our property “PeakHill”.

I would call this Industrial Development an OFFENSIVE development as we have this beautiful, quiet and peaceful paradise, OUR HOME, on 120 acres on the hill west of Scone (looking over Scone Township), and now somebody wants to come and spoil our Environment (that’s our HUMAN environment) with this big, ugly, huge industrial development that we did not have a say in the first place about whether to allow it to be built or not.”

Letter dated 12th August 2009, Question No.1.

“I am writing to you as I know the deadline is well past for submissions BUT, My wife has developed a hearing problem that we think you should take into account for the above Industrial Wind Farm.

My Wife has had an operation and been in St Vincents Hospital for near a week, the operation did not save her hearing in one ear but she has about 50% in the other ear and now wears a hearing aid in that ear.

We enclose a short letter from her specialist to confirm the fact.

Since the operation we have tried to go about our normal lives but NOISE has a bad effect on her. Shopping centers, Restaurants, Coffee places, crowds, etc, these areas are of great concern as the NOISE really affect her, even in the car the window down a little the noise and the vibration of the wind does upset her.

I am getting around to asking you to consider the above Wind Farm above our home "PeakHill", there are 5 proposed turbines, we would like you to greatly consider removing these turbines as the effect of that NOISE and the dB(C) effect will considerable affect the quality of our lives. We feel that the "Wind Turbine Syndrome" will come into our family quickly, if they are allowed to be built.

*As I have stated in another of my submissions, we would prefer the whole area above our home to be **SOLAR**, not wind turbines."*

Pamada has altered the questions and answered; No. 56.

56. How many properties will have noise monitoring equipment and how will this be recorded if there is a complaint? How will I record complaints during construction and operation?

Noise compliance and ongoing noise monitoring locations would be identified by an appropriately qualified independent acoustic expert during preparation of the Operational Noise Management Plan. This plan would be prepared prior to construction activities commencing and would be submitted to the DoP for approval. The proponent would also adopt a complaints procedure during construction and ongoing operations as part of the 'Near Neighbours Strategy' for community consultation. A phone line will be provided for residences to record noise complaints during both construction and operation.

My response to their answer;

Non committed, what detail is there about the 'Near Neighbour Strategy', I want details not just words.

- **10. Noise Impact, No.61**

My question as in Submission No. 2, Question No.5 &13 &18.

also Letter dated 12th August 2009, Question No.1.

Submission No. 2, Question No.5

"I cannot find any readings or mention of the noise that Dr Nina Pierpont of Malone, NY., writes in her findings of the damage that the dB(C) vibrations have on our Human health. She testified before the New York State Legislature Energy Committee on March 7, 2006, (a file of her testimony is available for you on AWEO.org, these symptoms include;

**Sleep problems,*

**Headaches, which increased in frequency,*

**Dizziness, unsteadiness and nausea,*

**Problems with learning and concentration,*

**Tinnitus.*

**A setback from all homes is recommended of at least 3kms."*

Submission No. 2, Question No.13.

"6.2 Page 23 'Wind Farmer' noise prediction, does this program tell us information about the dB(C) Vibration effect???"

Submission No. 2, Question No.18.

"Table 7-1 Page 26, Location "PeakHill", why should we be forced to accept these higher noise levels than we are experiencing today, these figures are most definitely **NOT** acceptable to us."

Letter dated 12th August 2009, Question No.1

"I am writing to you as I know the deadline is well past for submissions BUT, My wife has developed a hearing problem that we think you should take into account for the above Industrial Wind Farm.

My Wife has had an operation and been in St Vincents Hospital for near a week, the operation did not save her hearing in one ear but she has about 50% in the other ear and now wears a hearing aid in that ear.

We enclose a short letter from her specialist to confirm the fact.

Since the operation we have tried to go about our normal lives but NOISE has a bad effect on her. Shopping centers, Restaurants, Coffee places, crowds, etc, these areas are of great concern as the NOISE really affect her, even in the car the window down a little the noise and the vibration of the wind does upset her.

I am getting around to asking you to consider the above Wind Farm above our home "PeakHill", there are 5 proposed turbines, we would like you to greatly consider removing these turbines as the effect of that NOISE and the dB(C) effect will considerable affect the quality of our lives. We feel that the "Wind Turbine Syndrome" will come into our family quickly, if they are allowed to be built.

As I have stated in another of my submissions, we would prefer the whole area above our home to be **SOLAR**, not wind turbines"

Pamada has altered the questions and answered; No. 61.

61. How far does dB(C) travel?

Infrasound or low frequency sound (dBC) is not audible to the human ear. Most modern wind turbines of upwind design do not produce low frequency noise. The effects or potential for infrasound have been further discussed in Section 1.2.5.1.

My response to their answer;

They have just not discussed my question and referred back to the 'EA'. Not good enough!

- 12. Aviation, No.75. NOT MY QUESTION but a No. 25 is in the reference column.
- 19. Transmission line No.93. NOT MY QUESTION but a No. 25 is in the reference column.

- 19. Transmission line No.93.

My question as in Submission No. 4, Question No.1 &2 &3 &4 &5 &6

Submission No. 4, Question No.1.

"I have studied the 'POWER LINE CONNECTIONS' and find a few things that I would like to ask questions about. Firstly, the option 2 that is the preferred ways to get the 'up to 90MW' to the Scone Energy Aust Substation, that is if the highest allowed output of energy from both Middlebrook and Mountain Stations is only 90MW, but I don't agree with the route the power is being suggested to be run to Scone."

Submission No. 4, Question No.2.

"We have been telling Mr Mark Dixon for the past two years that 'WINTERS ROAD' is NOT a public road, it is PRIVATE PROPERTY and with the owner refusing to allow any poles or power lines to run along his private road, that means that Mr Dixon has not been listening to this for that time."

Submission No. 4, Question No.3.

"Before I get into the other routes for the power to run, I want to ask....Why does the energy that is generated by the 31 turbines, the 54,000 Solar Panels and the Hydro loop need to be sent to the substation at 'Bunnan Road' then to be sent all the way back to Turbine No 31 to be sent down the Government Road (we call it a 'Paper Road') near to my home "PeakHill". It seems a contradiction in movement of the energy, as I thought the energy is at the substation and right at Bunnan Road then it should be sent down Bunnan Road to the Scone Substation (not back to Turbine 31)."

Submission No. 4, Question No.4.

"Another problem that the Industrial Energy Park proponent will have IF you allow the energy to be sent back down to near turbine No 31, is that the Government Roads that the proponent is trying to use, comes to an abrupt halt and need to go over private property to continue down Puen Buen Pit Road. From what I hear from the owner of that property is that the proponent will NOT be getting that approval for the energy to go across their property. Again the best route for the energy is from the substation on Mountain Station via Bunnan road to the Scone town substation. I read that the proponent wants you, the Dept of Planning to allow for future expansion of the energy production on these Industrial Energy Parks, so they want you to grant them the OK to have a greater energy production more than 90MW and therefore they will then run the energy to the Muswellbrook connection points, but again I don't want ANY of that energy to come down the Government Road just a few hundred meters from our home "PeakHill". So I want the energy to go to the Mountain Station Substation and then on the Bunnan Road to Yarrandi, Moobi, to Nandowra road (also on maps as 'Old Muswellbrook Road) then onto the Muswellbrook connections".

Submission No. 4, Question No.5.

I have a question that a neighbour bought up, if a Government road is used by the proponent then they have to buy that land from the State Government for the same terms that we the landowner are required to??? Then when the proponent owns the Government Road they have to have it properly surveyed and then fenced on both sides as they would not want stock roaming all over their property?? I hope that the Proponent can't just use the Government Road without buying it from the State Government?

Submission No. 4, Question No.6.

And I repeat, Option 2 running the Power poles and lines along "Winters Road" is NOT an option as it is private property.

Pamada has altered the questions and answered; No.95.

93. Electricity is sent from turbines to Bunnan Rd substation then back where it came through to the Winters Rd. It seems a waste and the line should run into Scone substation as opposed to going back through the site.

All generators are reticulated to a single substation on Mountain Station, prior to external connection to the grid. The substation has been located on Mountain Station in a cleared, flat and accessible location with low to negligible visual impact. Cumulative noise impacts from the substation conform to relevant noise guidelines.

Option 2 (see Figure 19.2 of Volume 1 of the EA) utilises Winters Rd for more direct access to Scone substation. There are still some land-use conflicts identified in this option (see Section 1.2.15)

My response to their answer;

This has avoided my questions altogether, why can't the DoP get Pamada to answer my questions directly, or can they?

- **19. Transmission line No.99.**

My question as in Submission No.2 , Question No.5.

"I cannot find any readings or mention of the noise that Dr Nina Pierpont of Malone, NY., writes in her findings of the damage that the dB(C) vibrations have on our Human health. She testified before the New York State Legislature Energy Committee on March 7, 2006, (a file of her testimony is available for you on AWEO.org, these symptoms include;

**Sleep problems,*

**Headaches, which increased in frequency,*

**Dizziness, unsteadiness and nausea,*

**Problems with learning and concentration,*

**Tinnitus.*

**A setback from all homes is recommended of at least 3kms."*

Pamada has altered the questions and answered; No.99.

20. Safety and Environmental Risk

97. Please discuss the potential of anxiety and stress for locals arising from the development. Please refer to 'Wind Farm Syndrome' and best practices to mitigate the effects. It was suggested a study be undertaken by a local university to test the health impacts of living near a wind farm. Dr Nina Pierpont recommendations are that 3MW machines are 3-5km from any residential block. Please discuss Vibro- acoustic disease as part of response.

For issues surrounding Infrasound and potential impacts from Wind Turbine Syndrome as raised by Dr Nina Pierpoint see Section 1.2.5.1.

My response to their answer;

Pamada have tried to undo the damage they have caused by saying that Wind Farm Syndrome did not exist, now, because of all the publicity on TV and newspapers, they are now saying that it does exist, but they still have not gone into details, again.

.....

I find it offensive that my questions to the Dept of Planning can be given to Pamada then Pamada be allowed to alter the questions to suit themselves.

The answers to these altered questions are just a side step & twaddle with no detail again. This has been the same with Pamada since May 2006 (our first meeting at our home and what a shock at the number and size of these industrial machines), smoke & mirrors with insufficient detail in the answers.

IMPORTANT.

If Pamada have now pulled 8 turbines off the Middlebrook side of the project, that is about 80% of the Middlebrook site gone. So with overall (Middlebrook and Mountain Station) that means that 19% of the whole project has been wiped off the Pamada 'EA'. This does not show Pamada as the 'Good Guys' in this project, quite the opposite.

It seems to me that **now that the proposal has been altered by 19%, yes a massive change, the whole existing 'EA' should be scrapped and a fresh NEW 'EA' be written** and submitted to you, the Dept of Planning. Ofcourse with the public viewing etc. all over again with us, the public, being given 3 months to write our submissions (not just the 30 days as before).

My reasoning for calling for the rewriting of this 'EA', is that there are so many pieces of the original 'EA' that have been changed or cancelled, then when Pamada sell-on this project the next owner (possibly the builder) will have ridged guidelines NOT this mishmash that the present 'EA' will present.

Last but not least, my Wife and I are still waiting on an apology from Pamada or their consultant whom wrote those offending words that we wrote about in our Submission 2;

"Firstly I would like to point out that my Wife and I would like a written apology from the proponents of the above industrial energy park, as there have been incorrect terms used in the 'EA' to do with the description of our Home ("PeakHill"). The words 'Non Landowner Residence' are unacceptable and degrading to us, we do own our property and an apology is necessary to us without further explanations."

We will only accept a written apology as Pamada have allowed those incorrect words to be used in their 'EA'.

Yours Sincerely,

Keith Thompson. J.P. nsw

P.S. I make a note for the DoP. The words 'Acceptable Noise Criteria' keep showing up in the 'EA' and in the response to our questions. My question to the DoP and the DECC, "To whom's 'Acceptable Noise Criteria', OURS as Human Beings that live at

“PeakHill” or is it the South Australian, DECC, or the DoP...Whom I suspect don't live here at Scone? YOUR ANSWER PLEASE.....

CC. To the Rural Wind Farm Inquiry.