

14/6/2019

Dear Commissioners Duncan and Cochrane

Rejection of MOD 1 Crudine Ridge Wind Farm

Drawing you attention to CWP Renewables propensity to disregard compliance.

Bocco Rock Wind Farm: Although Bocco Rock was sold to EGCO in 2013 CWP Renewables acted as Principal Representative during the projects construction. Please see the following link where CWP Renewables confirms that they were involved up until the end of Construction.

<https://cwprenewables.com/projects/wind/>

Please see the following link that confirms that Bocco Rock Wind Farm, which CWP renewables was responsible for constructing received a noncompliance for interfering with Aboriginal Artefacts in 2016

<https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Media-Releases/2016/May/05052016-department-fines-boco-rock-wind-farm-for-disturbing-aboriginal-heritage-sites.pdf>

Thank you

Sue Lane



14/6/2019

Rejection MOD 1 Crudine Ridge Wind Farm

Dear Commissioners,

I note with interest an Email that we gained through the Freedom of Information Act,

FOI 17065 Document 113

In This Email Sent from the Federal Department of Environment and Energy (DOEE) to CWP Renewables Mark Branson on the 16th February 2017.

DOEE wanted some points Clarified

“I wanted to confirm that the size (in particular height) of the turbines has not changed from the 77 layout to the 38(ie in order to reduce the number of turbines you have not increased the size”

“The height of the Turbines are capped at 160 metres maximum through the NSW conditions, with blade lengths between 40 and 63 metres. I would like to confirm this maximum height and blade length range is what has been presented in the wire-frames and photo – montages of the 17th January 2017 letter”

So on the 16 February 2017 the DOEE did not know of the increase in Blade size to 67metres.

Were the DOEE ever informed of the increase in blade size?

What was Mark Branson reply to this email?

Why wasn't the DOEE approached for a modification for this increase in blade size?

If Ed Mousney knew he was going to have an increase Blade size when **he** dropped the number to 37, why was that not reported to the DOEE?

There was a letter sent to the DOEE on the 17th January 2017 regarding wire frames and photo montages etc wouldn't that have been the time to tell the DOEE of the increased blade size?

So if the blade is 67 metres in length, therefore does not make the wireframe based on smaller blade size obsolete?

Where is that letter that was sent to the DOEE 17th January 2017?

I am happy to forward this email to you if it is required.

Thank You

Sue Lane





Copy to:
Secretary
Mr Knudson
Mr Cahill

Chief of Staff
s22

To: Minister for the Environment and Energy (for decision)

**EPBC ACT FINAL APPROVAL DECISION: CRUDINE RIDGE WIND FARM, NSW
(EPBC 2011/6206)**

Timing: 14 March 2017

Recommendations:

1. That you approve the Crudine Ridge Wind Farm proposal in accordance with the briefing package at Attachments A to P1.

Minister:

Comments:

A very difficult case, with some families opposed. Please ensure the proponents are held strongly to account for their required offsets + responsibilities

Approved / Not approved

Date:

4/4/17

Clearing Officer:	Kim Farrant	Assistant Secretary Assessments (NSW, ACT) and Fuel Branch/ESD	Ph: [REDACTED] Mob: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14/03/2017			
Contact Officer:	s22	Director, Northern NSW Assessment Section	Ph: [REDACTED] Mob: [REDACTED]

Key Points:

1. Crudine Ridge Wind Farm Pty Ltd (the proponent) proposes to construct and operate a new wind farm located approximately 45 km south of Mudgee and 45 km north of Bathurst on the Central Tablelands of NSW.
2. The NSW Planning Assessment Commission issued its Determination approving the project for up to 77 turbines, on 10 May 2016, with conditions.
3. Subsequent to the EPBC Act proposed approval decision of 14 July 2016, a reduced wind turbine layout of 37 turbines has been put forward by the proponent for consideration. The proponent considers that the reduced turbine layout will achieve environmental gains and will accommodate the concerns of neighbouring residents, in light of social and economic impacts.
4. The project will generate up to 420 gigawatt hours of electricity annually (based on an installed electricity capacity of up to 135 megawatts), which is equivalent to powering 56,700 homes. The project is calculated to save about 363,500 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions each year, and contribute approximately 0.67 per cent towards the national Renewable Energy Target. The project is expected to employ up to 75 people during construction and 15 people during operations.
5. The Department recommends approval of the proposed action under Part 9 of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act), with conditions, as outlined in the final approval decision brief at Attachment A. There are limited impacts to EPBC matters, and the final approval requires that the proponent provides environmental offsets.

18/6/2019

Dear Commissioners

Rejection of the MOD 1 Crudine Ridge Wind Farm

When I asked for a meeting with you, private wasn't the word I should have used, but the meaning was there and that is I wanted you to sit across or around a table to meet the people who put a rejection into this Modification. CWP Renewables and the DPE's Mike Young had this opportunity and I thought it would be fair that the people who would be directly impacted by this proposal should have that access as well. Good people who have held CWP renewables to account, something the DPE should do, but they have not.

Some points I would like you know:

- People who have put rejections into this proposal are from both the North and South side of this project. Mike Young implied when talking to you it was just from the South side that is not case.
- On my previous Submission to you from the public meeting on the 11.6.2019, I spoke to you about CWP Renewables lying about using Sally's Flat Road. The following link is from the CWP Renewables CCC meeting page 5 under Road Up Grades. They clearly state that Sally's Flat Road would not be used. This is just another example of CWP Renewables deceit.

<https://www.crudineridgewindfarm.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/CRWF-CCC-Finalised-Minutes-26-4-18.pdf>

Please access the CWP renewables complaints line where we registered our complaints regarding the horrendous dust that we were experiencing.

- **Facebook:** Mr Mounsey made reference to their transparency and that they had a Facebook page

Points I would like to clarify about this page:

- Again Negative Comments can be deleted and that person blocked
- No pictures of the cleared area that CWP destroyed.
- Only Pictures of Aarons pass road are from Pyramul end, no pictures of the actual road, they are not showing what they want to destroy.
- Where is the letter that CWP Renewables sent out to host landowners, telling them to go to the DPE meeting on the

12/12/18. Here the pack mentality that was in that hall was a disgrace, if you would like to have further evidence of the attempted intimidation by host landowners encourage by Brenden McAvoy of CWP Renewables, please contact former NSW DPE Compliance Officer Chris Shultz, who I found in our dealings with him, to be a complete professional

- **Intimidation**

I would have thought that the DPE would take a very dim view of any intimidation in regards Wind Farms. Broken communities!

The DPE meeting was run by Mike Young and staff.

Mr Young at **no time** tried to stop the behaviour of host landowners in fact encouraged it by asking for a show of hands.

You as Commissioners who go into broken Communities, know full well what this action then set in place. This is a photo taken by the Mudgee Guardian.

I believe that Mr Mike Young put us at risk.



<https://images.app.goo.gl/33d7Eo3yvkch8Fkx6>

Submission to the Department of Planning and Environment Not Included in their report:

I placed into the Department a Submission of Rejection to the Crudine Ridge Wind Farm Modification 1, under the Facebook Group that I Manage.

NO WIND FARMS NEAR HOMES

I have 600 follows so I think this counts as a community group.

It has not made mention as an organisation objection in the table of the DPE Assessment report.

It doesn't fit Mr Young's rhetoric and therefore he left it out?

Complicit, complacent or incompetent?

CWP Renewables Lack Of Integrity

Lastly I would like show you a hand written note put on the Conditions of Consent by the then Minister for Environment and Energy, Josh Frydenberg.

We obtained this Under FOI 170605 Document 1

You will see that He has hand written a note,

“a very difficult case, with some families opposed. Please ensure the proponents are held strongly to account for their required offsets and responsibilities 4/4/2017”

Please note Commissioners, CWP Renewables knew at the time that Minister Frydenberg was writing this hand written words the consent condition that he was putting his name to were already obsolete.

Hold this company to account Commissioners, we have shown you enough facts back up by **evidence** to reject this Modification.

Thank you

Sue Lane

