



JENNIFER SMITH

SUPPORT

Submission No: 165570

Organisation:		Key issues: <i>Biodiversity, Agricultural impacts and land use, Social and economic</i>
Location: <i>New South Wales 2354</i>		
Submitter Type: <i>I am the owner or a tenant of a neighbouring property to the proposed development</i>		
Attachment: <i>Final Thunderbolt project submission_14032024_V2.pdf</i>		

Submission date: 3/25/2024 7:16:35 AM

see attached

DJ & JL Smith

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
KENTUCKY NSW 2354

Re. Thunderbolt Wind Project

Dear Sir,

We wish to make a final submission in relation to the proposed Neoen Thunderbolt Wind Project following the public forum held at Kentucky on 14th March 2024. Below we list items we regard to require further consideration.

1. The current intention that the Community Fund is managed by the two associated local governments, rather than a local committee, is undesirable and unacceptable in our view. We are pessimistic about the desire and capability of the local councils to adequately fulfill the role of appropriately managing these funds. Under this arrangement, we believe that the funds will be predominantly spent in the larger centres of those local government areas, rather than within the communities in close proximity (5-10km) to the project, and much of the funds will likely be squandered in paying a council employee to manage the funds. From our perspective, neither of these local councils have good track records in financial management. Further, if the community fund were managed by the actual local community, that may facilitate bringing the local community back together (given it is clearly divided at this stage).
2. Neoen have reported strong (>70%) local community support for this Project based on their survey results. The large majority of attendees at the public hearing on 14/03/2024 (many of which were not locals) were opposers of the Project. As mentioned by Darren Smith in his presentation, we (who are long term locals), believe that support in the local community is actually strong and unwavering. However, many of those who are in favour of the Project are unwilling to support the project publicly. We believe this is because they do not want to expose themselves to the verbal abuse, intimidation, and harassing behaviours of the vocal minority who oppose the Project. Examples of this include a) public ridicule and abuse such as that directed at Darren Smith at the public forum, and b) continued on social media after the event (Friends of Kentucky Action Group Facebook page). It is for this reason, that the 'quiet supporters' choose not to attend or participate publicly.
3. The idea put forward by many of the opposers of the project that development of the project will cause deterioration of the local natural environment may not necessarily be correct. With due diligence from the developer *and* a proactive attitude from the landowners involved, the local environment may actually benefit. For example, landowners who receive payments (either as hosts or neighbours) will be provided additional income. There is opportunity for those beneficiaries to enhance the natural environment on their properties - those funds could be directed toward better land management and could enable them to run their grazing businesses more conservatively. Both of these practices could enhance the existing natural environment.
4. We remain concerned with the issue of guarantee of decommissioning. Regulations around decommissioning should be determined at State or preferably Federal

government level and be consistent across all renewable energy projects going forward. The proposal of up-front bond payable by the developer should be further considered.

5. Public submissions supplied on 14/03/2024 indicated that perhaps there is more that should be done in terms of monitoring of local waterways both during construction and operation for ongoing evaluation of impacts of the construction, erosion, water use, etc. We would be in support of such a measure.
6. It appears that some people who are adversely affected and actively opposed to the Project suffer with psychosocial issues and stresses associated with this. While there is onus on the individual to take action to aid themselves, perhaps this indicates that there should also be some government or energy-industry funded psychological assistance available to people adversely affected by these types of Projects. Or, if such services already exist, better promotion may be required.
7. We regard that biodiversity offsets should be located very close to the Project itself, rather than in locations remote of the Project location.
8. The Neighbour Benefit Sharing Fund outlined by Neoen should be indexed for the life of the project. This will ensure that the benefit defined is available at the same rate in 30 years time.

Kind Regards

DJ and JL Smith (Darren and Jennifer)