

This submission is made without prejudice:

I live in the area sandwiched between the Tilt and ACEN developments.

We are growers of cereal and oilseed crops, and we produce beef cattle. Our crops regularly win awards. We use modern varieties and modern equipment. Our environment and soil type is such that we can produce crops no matter the season, this is Biophysical Strategic Agricultural land (BSAL).

We have cropping paddocks adjacent to the ACEN turbines on our Western Boundary. In keeping with best practice farming, we rotate the crops we sow to reduce disease and weed resistance. At present our rotation includes canola and wheat and we are currently looking to include pulses such as faba beans and/or chickpeas into our rotation. Our cropping decisions are made in conjunction with our agronomist and based around sustainability.

There have been numerous times over the last few years we have required aerial applications of our crops to address pest threats: mice in sorghum, slugs in wheat, Russian wheat aphid in wheat, fungicide for canola. Timeliness is vital and aerial applications are dependent on the weather and aircraft availability. Once the decision is made that an aerial application is warranted the day and time of the application is unknown. It is not uncommon to be advised on the day when the aerial application will take place.

Aerial applications consider wind direction, wind strength and inversion or drift that could impact neighbouring land. This is particularly the case when there are different crops nearby.

The Milan (Italy) based co-author of the T070 report has 3 years' experience in the civil aviation sector. His skills include airfield design and traffic forecasts. No mention of the impact of wind turbines and wake turbulence on aerial applications to crops.

The Victorian based co author of the T070 report, lists his experience in town planning and airport planning. Please detail his experience on the

impact of wind turbines and wake turbulence on aerial application to crops.

The authors of the T070 report quite likely have zero understanding of aerial agricultural applications and the need for timeliness while balancing the weather conditions and aircraft availability. For example, do either of them understand that aerial applications are used rather than ground applications to avoid damage to a mature crop?

The response by DPHI to the above information at the Independent Planning Commission meeting clearly showed that she either did not listen to the proceedings (she was not at the public meeting, her response was by phone) or despite the details provided she had no interest in understanding aerial agriculture.

Given the plague of feral pigs in the area we have conducted multiple aerial culling programs. These are done by helicopter, and some have been conducted by Local Land Services but most in our area have been privately funded by the landowners along Tongy Lane. Given our high value crops and the significant losses by unchecked feral pig populations we are dependent on aerial culling programs to assist our efforts to control the population. Wake turbulence from wind turbines will limit our ability to conduct aerial culling programs.

At no stage has the department addressed aerial agriculture or aerial culling. Their whole focus on aerial anything to date has been on attempting to prove that the Tongy and Turee airstrips will not be impacted, and neither will aerial firefighting. This does not address aerial agriculture where the application is to the land on the immediate boundary to the wind turbines.

Is the department not able to understand this? Or is the department unwilling to understand this? Contacting an organisation like Aerial Application Association of Australia would be more educative to the Department than some global organisation that don't know the first thing about aerial applications.

DPHI on page 54 of their recommendation to the Independent Planning Commission state:

The project is located 6 km south of Coolah Airport and 56 km north of Mudgee Airport. There are also two private air strips in proximity to the project – Tongy Aerodrome (approximately 1.4

km from the nearest turbine) and Turee Aerodrome (approximately 2.4 km from the nearest turbine).

This is not accurate and is contradictory to the ACEN information. We as owners of the Turee ALA are not confident that the Department or ACEN have correctly assessed impacts to the ALA given that both provide us with different information.

To access European markets, we are required to be accredited with Sustainable Grain Australia. The sustainable grain assessment asks if there were any significant structures built on the property in the past year? If the answer is yes, then an environmental impact assessment/building permit must be produced. Significant structures would include transmission towers, BESS, sub stations, switching stations, Turbines, accommodation camps, industrial scale solar.

When will the presence of these structures exclude farmers from the European market? When will we be excluded from all grain/oilseed markets given the contamination from leading edge erosion of turbines blades? Are the ACEN turbine blades BPA free? Can the NSW Government guarantee that these industrial developments on our boundary will not prevent us from accessing our markets? Quoting American Clean Power Association “fact” sheets is insufficient given the obvious conflict of interest with the membership base of American Clean Power being wind, solar, transmission and storage developers and associated construction businesses for these projects.

It is very obvious that no research has been done on the issue of potential land contamination. It is negligent of the NSW Government to state that:

*wind turbine electricity does not
involve the production of pollutants, emissions or waste which can
have significant effects on our health or wellbeing*

Where is the research? Has research been conducted on livestock, native animals and humans? If there has been research how independent is this research?

If there is no risk why does the Meat Livestock Association question meat producers about livestock access to transmission, electricity infrastructure, solar panels and turbines in the Livestock Producer Assurance program that all producers must undertake?

What research has the AMA undertaken? Previous Commission reports have stated the AMA says there are no health impacts.

The commission has previously stated that “there are unlikely to be contamination risks from BPA from wind turbine blades”. “Unlikely” is not good enough for us – this is our business and the NSW Government is planning for us to be the first community in NSW to live in a “modern day power plant” with no understanding of the cumulative impacts, no cumulative impact study, no understanding of the impacts to agriculture and no research on the impacts to health of livestock, humans, native animals, water and soil.

What is the wear guarantee on the front edge of the blade? There are 393 blades in this project, how much of this wear material will end up in the environment?

Why is the NSW Government not applying the precautionary principle: decision makers should adopt precautionary measures when scientific evidence about an environment/human health hazard is uncertain, and the stakes are high.

Can the NSW Government give us a guarantee that our crops, pastures and water sources will not be contaminated from “forever chemicals” used in the BESS/Transmission/Turbines and Switching stations?

When will land with these “structures” be restricted from Sustainable Grain Australia because of the contamination.

What research is being done on the drying effect of wind turbines?

What research is being done on the impact of wind turbines on downwind meteorology and rainfall?

What research is being done on the impact of wind turbines on aerial agriculture?

Why has the NSW Government not utilised the genuine expertise and experience of Australian Aerial Ag operators (eg Aerial Application Association of Australia, they have been around since 1958, and their operations include crop spraying, fertilising, sowing, locust and mouse plague control and firebombing). AAAA work closely with State and Federal agencies on a range of policy issues.

Why does the Meat Livestock Association want to know if you are hosting wind turbines/transmission/solar? Is this because they are adopting the precautionary measures BUT the NSW Government is not?

The enormous cumulative impact of wind turbines on our business and those around us has not been addressed. The Government's own Cumulative impact guidelines have not been followed. The department has not presented a whole of government evaluation of issues in its assessment report.

There are many unresolved issues from the community and NSW government agencies.

This is the **first time** in NSW the Independent Planning Commission has to deliberate on a project that will:

- Enclose a community and the whole town of Coolah with turbines and transmission infrastructure that will leave hundreds of people without effective aerial firefighting.

Pilots don't want to die on the job, they will avoid the area rather than plunge into turbines and transmission lines protruding into the sky from all ridges. Remember it is a smoke-filled atmosphere; the commissioners did not appear to understand that aerial fire fighters fly in a smoke-filled atmosphere – that is the job! Review the footage of the Hercules dropping fire retardant on the fire on the Golden Highway at the end of Tongy Lane – you can barely see the aircraft, but you can see the pink fire retardant it is dropping. This aircraft is just above the tree line. Trees will be dwarfed by 250 metre high turbines.

Is the wind farm operator even going to allow the fire retardant to be dropped on their infrastructure?

- Knowingly impacting on the value of home and land in the town and the community given that nobody seeks a house that has views of turbines and the associated turbine noise. You heard from speakers will real and recent evidence that their home/land is unsaleable – buyers walk away – when they learn of the turbine developments nearby. A quick internet search shows the house prices in Coolah dropped in the last 12 months. Do the research before you sentence

a community to a future of not being able to sell their homes/land. Given the lack of services as people get older, they may want to move to locations where there are more services – how do they do this if they cannot sell their home? Or if the value of their home has sharply declined because they live in a “modern day power station”.

No town has yet been surrounded by turbines like the NSW Government plan for Coolah.

- Render high value agriculture land unable to conduct aerial agriculture given the wake turbulence from wind turbines and presence of transmission and turbines on all ridges. Get some appropriate advice, not that of a Global company who will never take responsibility for the destruction of food producing land in Australia.

This project should not progress