Proposed Development of

Bango Wind Farm

Southern Tablelands, New South Wales

Amended DA

May 2017



Prepared for Bango Wind Farm Pty Ltd by CWP Renewables Pty Ltd

Table of Contents

Contents

| 1. | Project Background | 1 |
|----|----------------------------------|----|
| 2. | Proposed Amendment | 2 |
| 3. | Traffic and Transport Assessment | 13 |
| 4. | Amended Residence Assessment | 19 |
| 5. | Visual Impact Assessment Update | 25 |
| 6. | Residual Impact Assessment | 37 |
| 7. | Statement of Commitments | 40 |
| 8. | Conclusion | 63 |

Appendix A – A3 Sized Project Maps

Appendix B – Consultant Reports and Correspondence

Table of Figures

| Figure 1: Bango Wind Farm Locality Map | 1 |
|---|----|
| Figure 2: Original Project Layout 1 with areas for wind turbine removal highlighted | 2 |
| Figure 3: Amended Layout 1 – Detail | 3 |
| Figure 4: Amended Layout 2 – Detail | 4 |
| Figure 5: Layout 1 - Project Overview Map | 9 |
| Figure 6: Layout 1 - Project Overview Constraints Map | 10 |
| Figure 7: Layout 2 - Project Overview Map | 11 |
| Figure 8: Layout 2 - Project Overview Constraints Map | 12 |
| Figure 9: Wind Farm Main Entrance – Lachlan Valley Way | 14 |
| Figure 10: Main Entrance Option 2 - Vegetation | 15 |
| Figure 11: Photomontage and wireframe locations map | 26 |
| Figure 12: Shadow Flicker diagram from EIS LVIA | 35 |

Table of Tables

| Table 1: Amended Project Components and Comparison with Approved Parameters |
|---|
| Table 2: Land Tenure6 |
| Table 3: Layout 1 Wind turbine centre-point coordinates (GDA 94 Zone 55) |
| Table 4: Layout 2 Wind turbine centre-point coordinates (GDA 94 Zone 55) |
| Table 5: Proposed solutions to Council road concerns 16 |
| Table 6: Updated Residence Summary, including revised proximity and status |
| Table 7: Modification response to community concerns 25 |
| Table 8: Non-involved residences impacted by removal of turbines in the north east |
| Table 9: Non-involved residences impacted by removal of turbines in the south east |
| Table 10: Non-involved residences impacted by removal of turbines in the south west |
| Table 11: Non-involved residences impacted by removal of turbines in the north west |
| Table 12: Non-involved residence impacted by removal of northern of Kangiara turbines |
| Table 13: Residual impact on previous host landowners 34 |
| Table 14: Changes to Shadow Flicker Assessment |
| Table 15: Residual Impact Assessment |

1. Project Background

The Bango Wind Farm Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (Project Application SSD 6686) considered a project of up to 118 wind turbines at a maximum tip height of 200 m, and associated ancillary infrastructure, located between the townships of Boorowa and Rye Park, approximately 25 km north of Yass, New South Wales (NSW) (Figure 1 shows Figure 2.1 from the EIS).



Figure 1: Bango Wind Farm Locality Map

The EIS was placed on public exhibition over a period of 60 days during October to December 2016, over which time 106 submissions were received. Of those 106 submissions, approximately 34 % were in support, 54 % in opposition, and 12 % provided comment. Within these submissions, key areas of concern included:

- Visual impacts to neighbouring non-involved landowners;
- Impacts to the local Council road network; and,
- Impacts on biodiversity.

The Response to Submissions (RTS) report provides a position on these key aspects in addition to responses to all other issues raised during public exhibition.

The purpose of this document is to describe the changes made to the Project since the public exhibition of the EIS (including new measures of avoidance, management and mitigation) and provide an updated environmental assessment (where relevant) considering those changes.

Project Footprint: In evaluating the submissions received during public exhibition, the Proponent has elected to amend the Development Application (DA) for the Project to reduce both the on-ground footprint and associated above-ground impact through the removal of 43 and 35 potential wind turbine locations from Layout 1 and Layout 2 respectively.

The resultant Project will comprise a wind farm, with the flexibility to select wind turbine locations from either Layout 1 or Layout 2, up to a maximum of 75 locations.

Importantly, access routes and pathways of the proposed on-ground infrastructure throughout the retained sections of the Project remain unchanged.

The reduction in potential wind turbine locations are from five key areas of the Project, but most notably involves the removal of the Langs Creek cluster in its entirety.

Figure 2 provides a high-level overview of the proposed amendment to the Project footprint, with Figure 3 and Figure 4 defining the resultant Layout 1 and Layout 2 Project footprints.



Figure 2: Original Project Layout 1 with areas for wind turbine removal highlighted



| | Removed Turbines Agreement Status Agreement Signed Poficed Agreement | Removed Access Track Grand Access Track Unsealed Road Sealed Road Sealed Road 132 kV Transmission Line | TITLE REDUCED LAYOUT AGREEMENT STATUS | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------|--|
| | Seeking Agreement Non-Involved | LGA Boundary | DATE 21 APR 2017 | scale 1:69000 | DWG NO BAN-143 | REV | VER 1 | |
| SCALE BAR | 0 | 4 km | DRAWN BY B KRONENBERG | CHECKED BY | SHEET 1 OF 2 | јов NO 080811 | SIZE A3 | |

Figure 3: Amended Layout 1 – Detail



| reement reement ed | Overhead Transmission Line LGA Boundary | DATE 04 MAY 2017 | DATE SCALE DWG NO 04 MAY 2017 1:69000 BAN-143 | | | VER 1 | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|--|
| | 4 km | DRAWN BY B KRONENBERG | CHECKED BY | SHEET 2 OF 2 | јов NO 080811 | SIZE A3 | | |

Figure 4: Amended Layout 2 – Detail

•

0

SCALE BAR

The effect of this amendment to the Project is a decrease across all associated infrastructure such as roads, hardstands, over/under-ground cabling, and rotor swept area, which is detailed below in Table 1.

| Project Aspect | Units | Comparison with Exhibited Project | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Project Site | | | |
| Area of land within the cadastre boundaries of all | 5,200 hectares (ha) | Reduced by 2,483 ha | |
| properties subject to this proposal | | | |
| Development Corridor | | | |
| Area within the Project Site within which the | 1,148 ha | Reduced by 740 ha | |
| Development Footprint is contained | | | |
| Development Footprint | | | |
| Area of all Permanent and Temporary Project | 129 ha | Deduced by 112 be | |
| infrastructure including temporary disturbances | 138 //a | Reduced by 113 ha | |
| within the Development Corridor | | | |
| Permanent Development Footprint | | | |
| Area of all Permanent (only) Project infrastructure | 89 ha | Reduced by 46 ha | |
| within the Development Corridor | | | |

| Dormanant Draiget Infractructure | Linite | Comparison with | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| remanent Project innastructure | Units | Exhibited Project | |
| Wind turbine generators | 75 (61) | Reduced by 43 (31) | |
| Tip height | 200 m | No change | |
| Rotor diameter | 144 m | No change | |
| Swept area (individual wind turbine) | 16,286 m ² | No change | |
| Swept area (wind farm total maximum) | 1,221,450 m ² | Reduced by 700,298 m ² | |
| Hardstands (individual) | 1,250 m ² | No change | |
| Hardstands (wind farm total maximum) | 93,750 m ² | Reduced by 53,750 m ² | |
| Footings | 625 m ² | No change | |
| Footings (wind farm total maximum) | 46,875 m ² | Reduced by 26,875 m ² | |
| Road length | 56 km | Reduced by 27 km | |
| Overhead electrical reticulation and control cables | 5.5 km | Reduced by 4 km | |

| Tomporory Droject Infractructure | Unite | Comparison with | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--|
| remporary project infrastructure | Units | Exhibited Project | |
| Concrete batch plant options | 4 | Reduced by two options | |
| Concrete batch plant | 0.5 ha per site | Reduced by 1 ha | |
| Rock crushing facilities options | 4 | Reduced by two options | |
| Rock crushing facilities | 0.5 ha per site | Reduced by 1 ha | |
| Construction compound options | 2 | Reduced by two options | |
| Construction compound | 3 ha | Reduced by 6 ha | |

Land Tenure: The amended Project will be spread over 56 of the original 104 properties of the Project site with details of land tenure provided in Table 2.

| Landowner | Lot | DP | Landowner | Lot | DP |
|-------------|-----|---------|--------------|-----|--------|
| Landowner 3 | 213 | 754135 | Landowner 8 | 1 | 742223 |
| | 13 | 113987 | | 2 | 625384 |
| | 222 | 754135 | | 216 | 754143 |
| | 309 | 754135 | | 2 | 802580 |
| | 223 | 754135 | | 2 | 625285 |
| | 169 | 754135 | | 256 | 754143 |
| | 318 | 754135 | Landowner 9 | 297 | 754109 |
| | 224 | 754135 | | 242 | 754109 |
| | 319 | 754135 | Landowner 11 | 263 | 754109 |
| Landowner 4 | 1 | 625285 | | 285 | 754109 |
| | 202 | 754135 | | 309 | 754109 |
| | 271 | 754135 | | 115 | 754109 |
| | 281 | 754135 | | 284 | 754109 |
| | 1 | 625384 | Landowner 12 | 276 | 754143 |
| | 183 | 754143 | Landowner 14 | 238 | 754135 |
| | 167 | 754143 | | 139 | 754109 |
| | 212 | 754143 | | 48 | 754109 |
| | 3 | 625384 | | 287 | 754109 |
| | 317 | 754135 | | 87 | 754135 |
| | 2 | 1048648 | | 163 | 754135 |
| | 2 | 1187122 | | 162 | 754135 |
| | 3 | 1187122 | | 88 | 754135 |
| Landowner 5 | 292 | 754109 | | 31 | 754109 |
| | 160 | 754109 | | 300 | 754135 |
| Landowner 6 | 233 | 754135 | | 301 | 754135 |
| | 220 | 754135 | Landowner 15 | 268 | 754109 |
| | 228 | 754135 | | 234 | 754143 |
| | | | | 224 | 754143 |
| | | | | 1 | 83173 |

Table 2: Land Tenure¹

Agreements are being sought with those landowners whom, through the resultant changes to the project, have become ex-hosts. An updated Residence Assessment summary (consistent with the summary provided in Chapter 20 of the EIS), incorporating the change in host landownership, is provided in Section 6 of this document.

As is required under clause 49(a) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, landowner consent from all host landowners has been obtained and provided separately to the Department.

¹ Note that Landowner identification numbers have been taken from Appendix 1 of the EIS.

| | | | | - | |
|------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| Turbine ID | Easting | Northing | Turbine ID | Easting | Northing |
| 1 | 671618 | 6174752 | 60 | 671481 | 6173130 |
| 2 | 672551 | 6169350 | 61 | 672625 | 6168300 |
| 3 | 671220 | 6172725 | 62 | 671668 | 6167651 |
| 5 | 672506 | 6168805 | 63 | 663056 | 6174030 |
| 7 | 671261 | 6169917 | 65 | 663781 | 6172005 |
| 11 | 664944 | 6171739 | 67 | 672228 | 6170535 |
| 12 | 672635 | 6169745 | 69 | 669424 | 6173513 |
| 13 | 671656 | 6173805 | 71 | 669565 | 6173814 |
| 14 | 664721 | 6172733 | 72 | 663856 | 6171405 |
| 17 | 672377 | 6168142 | 73 | 665140 | 6172054 |
| 18 | 663601 | 6172799 | 76 | 665306 | 6176655 |
| 19 | 664006 | 6171605 | 79 | 663431 | 6171805 |
| 21 | 662281 | 6173305 | 80 | 671402 | 6173443 |
| 22 | 670581 | 6170580 | 81 | 669706 | 6171830 |
| 24 | 671306 | 6169580 | 83 | 669931 | 6172005 |
| 25 | 671131 | 6168379 | 85 | 670956 | 6171280 |
| 26 | 669892 | 6171233 | 86 | 665621 | 6171497 |
| 27 | 664756 | 6172455 | 87 | 663831 | 6172255 |
| 28 | 670262 | 6173541 | 88 | 663806 | 6174730 |
| 32 | 672716 | 6167943 | 89 | 663681 | 6173030 |
| 33 | 672070 | 6170045 | 91 | 669715 | 6174088 |
| 34 | 672357 | 6170336 | 94 | 664806 | 6174530 |
| 35 | 663756 | 6172505 | 95 | 670351 | 6173243 |
| 36 | 672238 | 6168456 | 96 | 664131 | 6173380 |
| 41 | 664931 | 6176230 | 97 | 664781 | 6175530 |
| 44 | 664806 | 6174230 | 98 | 665231 | 6176430 |
| 45 | 671006 | 6168951 | 100 | 670756 | 6171080 |
| 46 | 671465 | 6170340 | 102 | 672301 | 6167831 |
| 47 | 671217 | 6169267 | 104 | 664806 | 6173505 |
| 48 | 669615 | 6171540 | 107 | 672458 | 6168591 |
| 49 | 664831 | 6175855 | 110 | 671328 | 6172413 |
| 50 | 671015 | 6173890 | 111 | 671558 | 6167971 |
| 53 | 670056 | 6172655 | 114 | 663956 | 6173205 |
| 54 | 671370 | 6174593 | 115 | 664704 | 6175039 |
| 55 | 669956 | 6172305 | 118 | 664806 | 6173805 |
| 57 | 670581 | 6170855 | 119 | 662440 | 6173814 |
| 58 | 671287 | 6174189 | 122 | 672508 | 6169040 |
| 59 | 670190 | 6172964 | | | |

Table 3: Layout 1 Wind turbine centre-point coordinates (GDA 94 Zone 55)

Project Layouts comprising 75 (Layout 1) and 61 (Layout 2) respectively.

| Turbine ID | Easting | Northing | Turbine ID | Easting | Northing |
|------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| 1 | 670056 | 6172655 | 49 | 663856 | 6171405 |
| 2 | 671370 | 6174593 | 50 | 671054 | 6173944 |
| 3 | 669956 | 6172305 | 51 | 671465 | 6170340 |
| 5 | 671287 | 6174189 | 52 | 672310 | 6168689 |
| 6 | 670581 | 6170855 | 54 | 671217 | 6169267 |
| 7 | 671618 | 6174752 | 55 | 663656 | 6172955 |
| 8 | 671402 | 6173443 | 56 | 665621 | 6171497 |
| 9 | 672551 | 6169350 | 57 | 663806 | 6174730 |
| 10 | 669706 | 6171830 | 59 | 663756 | 6172505 |
| 11 | 671220 | 6172725 | 61 | 663056 | 6174030 |
| 13 | 669456 | 6173580 | 63 | 669634 | 6173944 |
| 15 | 662281 | 6173305 | 64 | 669615 | 6171540 |
| 16 | 672506 | 6168980 | 66 | 672635 | 6169745 |
| 19 | 672625 | 6168300 | 68 | 663431 | 6171805 |
| 22 | 665289 | 6176593 | 72 | 669756 | 6174180 |
| 24 | 671481 | 6173130 | 74 | 671031 | 6171355 |
| 25 | 664806 | 6173805 | 76 | 663956 | 6173205 |
| 27 | 664806 | 6174230 | 78 | 664021 | 6173610 |
| 28 | 672301 | 6167831 | 80 | 670331 | 6173405 |
| 29 | 664931 | 6176230 | 81 | 671328 | 6172413 |
| 31 | 671261 | 6169917 | 82 | 672228 | 6170535 |
| 32 | 670859 | 6171115 | 83 | 664781 | 6175530 |
| 33 | 671656 | 6173805 | 87 | 664704 | 6175039 |
| 34 | 670190 | 6172964 | 92 | 669892 | 6171233 |
| 39 | 664944 | 6171739 | 93 | 671295 | 6169503 |
| 41 | 671006 | 6168951 | 94 | 664131 | 6173380 |
| 42 | 663781 | 6172005 | 100 | 664803 | 6174672 |
| 43 | 664756 | 6173455 | 101 | 663965 | 6174234 |
| 44 | 671506 | 6167805 | 102 | 662538 | 6173952 |
| 45 | 664721 | 6172733 | 103 | 671131 | 6168379 |
| 48 | 664831 | 6175855 | | | |

Table 4: Layout 2 Wind turbine centre-point coordinates (GDA 94 Zone 55)

Project Maps: Figure 5 to Figure 8 provide further detail about the amended Project, Project Site, Development Corridor, Development Footprint and associated Project features and constraints.



Figure 5: Layout 1 - Project Overview Map



Figure 6: Layout 1 - Project Overview Constraints Map



Figure 7: Layout 2 - Project Overview Map



Figure 8: Layout 2 - Project Overview Constraints Map

3. Traffic and Transport Assessment

Site Access - Wind Turbine and Substation Components: The reduction in total wind turbine numbers will result in lesser impacts to the local road network. Specifically:

- The reduction in proposed wind turbine sites will relieve the RMS and local Council road network of associated construction impacts by a proportional scale and moreover will reduce the Project construction program; in doing so lessen the associated impacts to local road users over the construction period;
- The removal of the Langs Creek Cluster will remove the use of Hopefield Road within Hilltops Council Local Government Area (LGA);
- The removal of wind turbine locations from the northern part of the Mount Buffalo Cluster will remove the use of Hillview Lane, also in the Hilltops LGA; and,
- Significantly, the cumulative impact of these two amendments will result in there being no need to route over-dimensional vehicles carrying wind turbine components through the town of Boorowa, along Boorowa Road, or through the village of Rye Park.

Furthermore, it is proposed through this Amended DA that all over-dimensional vehicles carrying wind turbine and substation components are to access the Project via the access point off Lachlan Valley Way (RMS designated road). The intersection off Lachlan Valley Way (Figure 9, also included in appendix A) has been designed to comply with the *Austroads Guide to Road Design* (as amended by RMS) and includes a Basic Right Turn (BAR) and Basic Left Turn (BAL) intersection treatment. This change will result in those vehicles only intersecting Tangmangaroo Road at a single point where the road dissects the Kangiara and Mount Buffalo clusters. The consequential benefits of this action are two-fold:

- The avoidance of unnecessary widening (and biodiversity clearing) along whole sections of Wargeila and Tangmangaroo roads which may otherwise have been required to accommodate vehicles carrying wind turbine and substation over-dimensional components; and,
- The avoidance of a bridge/railway crossing on Wargeila road which has unknown structural integrity.

Site Access - Intersection off Lachlan Valley Way: Preliminary designs have been undertaken to confirm the suitability of the main access point of Lachlan Valley Way. Two design options have been suggested, both within the current development corridor and shown in Figure 9.

Option 1 has the entrance centred between a corner and a hill crest. This option requires the Safe Intersection Sight Distances (SISD) inputs to be reduced to values² that are acceptable by Austroads Standards but would need to be approved by the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS).

Option 2 moves the intersection 100 m north of its current location. SISD inputs are as per RMS standards but this option will require the removal of some vegetation, as indicated in Figure 10, to achieve acceptable sight distance. The trees targeted for removal are described as "Yellow Box (Eucalyptus melliodora) and Blakley's Red Gum (E. blakleyi) mature trees with lower tree layer of Lightwood (Acacia implexa) over a non-native grass layer dominated by pasture grasses including Cocksfoot (Dactylis glomerata)" and are part of the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act listed Endangered Ecological Community: White Box Yellow Box Blakely's Red Gum Woodland. Further survey of the area will be required for detailed planning for this Main Entrance option.

² These values are a 2.0 second reaction time (reduced from 2.5) and a deceleration coefficient value of 0.46 (reduced from 0.36)





Option 2

Option 1

Figure 9: Wind Farm Main Entrance – Lachlan Valley Way



Figure 10: Main Entrance Option 2 - Vegetation

Site Access - Balance of Plant and Resources: The Proponent acknowledges the feedback provided by Hilltops and Yass Valley Councils through the public exhibition of the EIS. In particular, the commentary regarding the impacts to the local Council road network pavements and associated safety concerns with the use of heavy vehicles ("truck-and-dog" arrangements) hauling balance of plant and resources to the Project Site. In response to this, a range of proposed solutions have been discussed with both Councils (summarised in Table 5 below), to address the uncertainty and risks identified by each, while retaining flexibility in the Project.

| Aspect | Response |
|--|---|
| | The Proponent requests that the location of these resource requirements is determined through a competitive tender process, however in doing so acknowledges Councils' concern that only appropriately licenced suppliers of resources will be used, unless materials are otherwise won within the Project site (for instance the use of material excavated from the wind turbine foundation sites). |
| The location and source (and the associated road routes) required for the delivery of resources (water, sand, | Nonetheless, it is proposed that the locations of known sources are identified and addressed in the Project Transport Management Plan (TMP), which is to be prepared to the satisfaction of RMS and the relevant Council, prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of works. |
| gravel, cement, etc.) to the Project Site. | It is also requested that additional TMPs be allowable to accommodate the introduction of new sources should they be identified during the construction period. All TMPs are to be prepared in consultation with RMS and the relevant Council. |
| | It is noted that the location of currently known and potential quarry sites were identified in the EIS Figure 3.9, however in accordance with the comments above, consideration of their licence status will be undertaken prior to use. |
| | The Proponent acknowledges and accepts that maintenance of the local Council road network (to the extent that impacts are caused by Project vehicles) is a requirement of the Project during the construction period, and that the associated costs are to be borne by the Project. |
| | The Proponent also acknowledges the current low levels of local traffic users on the known Project roads (Wargeila, Tangmangaroo, and Harry's Creek roads), and that speed (or the perception of speed) for construction vehicles is a concern for residents. |
| Maintenance of roads during construction | To address this matter, and in consideration of identifying the source of resource requirements as outlined above, the Proponent proposes to enter a Road Dilapidation Deed with each Council, prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of works. The Road Dilapidation Deed will clearly outline the responsibility of each party for the identification, prioritization, rectification of any defects, and the apportionment of costs of such works, and has been utilised by the Proponent on other projects - most recently at the Sapphire wind farm in northern NSW in consultation with Glen Innes Severn and Inverell Shire, Councils. |
| | The Road Dilapidation Deed will incorporate the requirements of pre- and post-dilapidation surveys, any necessary road upgrades and methods deemed appropriate for control of speed limits by construction vehicles. |

Table 5: Proposed solutions to Council road concerns

| Upgrades to roads | The Proponent acknowledges Council's responsibilities under the Roads Act 1993, and therefore the Proponent's own responsibilities in committing to appropriate upgrades and traffic management protocols to the local Council road network to ensure safe passage of vehicles during the construction period. In this regard, and as recommended above, the Proponent proposes to enter a Road Dilapidation Deed with each Council with respect to the required works. | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Timing of road upgrades | The Proponent requests that consideration is given to construction works that can occur in parallel to road upgrades. This request goes beyond the typical allowance of activities within the definition of "Pre-construction works" within recent planning approvals. It should be an "Early works" construction package that could be commenced prior to the completion of all required road upgrades, and would include the following activities: Commencement of construction of site access roads from the site entrances to the site facilities (site compound, substation, operations and maintenance facility, batching plant and crushing facility); Activities required to bench, install hardstand and temporary office facilities and amenities for temporary and permanent facilities across the Project; and, Onsite extraction and stockpiling of pavement materials in preparation for the commencement of construction. These works would typically require plant and equipment to be brought to site once, to be left within the Project Site to undertake works without consequential ongoing impacts to the local Council road network, other than those of light vehicles which are generally permitted under the recent standard definition of "Pre-construction works". The works would generally not require delivery of significant quantities of materials to or from the site using the public road network. It is proposed that final vehicle numbers and movements are to be determined through the finalisation of the TMP and Road Dilapidation Deeds, at which point the known construction partner will be on-board to advise on the construction program and preferred work fronts. | | | | | |
| Impacts on local sources of water, in particular potable and agricultural waters supplies. | to the local Council road network. This concern is noted and the scope provided to tendering construction contractors will include a directive that liaison with each Council and/or Department of Primary Industries (DPI) is required in relation to sourcing water for the Project. It is acknowledged that this is a particular concern for the Hilltops Council in the Boorowa area. | | | | | |
| Decommissioning | The Proponent's approach to provisioning funds for decommissioning is outlined in Chapter 18 of the EIS which will incorporate the costs associated with impacts to the local Council road network. | | | | | |

Site Access - Widening and Additional Vegetation Clearance: In addition to the aspects and proposed solutions outlined in Table 5 above, an additional assessment of Wargeila, Tangmangaroo and Harry's Creek roads, was undertaken to define preferred directional routes along each road, width and clearance requirements and suitable passing bay locations for the movement of Project vehicles (noting previous commitments to re-route over-dimensional vehicles hauling wind turbine and substation components via Lachlan Valley Way). This assessment was predicated on the concerns raised by both Councils with regard to the suitability of the local roads (in particular width, culvert and bridge crossings) to safely accommodate Project vehicles. However this has also been undertaken in response to the concerns raised by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) in relation to potential clearing of vegetation along the road verge.

The assessment identified that there is a bias towards an existing good width / low vegetation / various passing bay opportunities when travelling on:

- Tangmangaroo road north from the intersection with Lachlan Valley Way to the central Project entrances (this section of road is wholly within the Yass Valley Council LGA);
- Wargeila road south from Rye Park to the eastern Project entrance (this section of road is wholly within the Hilltops Council LGA); and,
- Either direction along Harry's Creek road between the central site entrances and Boowrowa road (this section of road is wholly within the Hilltops Council LGA).

While this assessment is not exhaustive, when taken into consideration alongside the re-routing of overdimensional project vehicles (which removes the need for re-alignment and widening and therefore vegetation clearing of the local Council road network), it will provide guidance and input into the preparation of the TMP and each Road Dilapidation Deeds. This guidance will serve to minimise:

- The extent of road routes used;
- The extent of road length and surface to be upgraded;
- Corresponding impacts to the local community; and
- Vegetation clearing associated with the Project.

The assessment also identified the location of all culverts and bridges along the local Council road network, which will also feed through into the TMP and Road Dilapidation Deed.

4. Amended Residence Assessment

A Residence Assessment Summary was included in Chapter 20 of the EIS summarising the outcomes of noise and visual assessments at residences where impacts had been identified. Table 6 below expands upon this considering feedback received during the public exhibition of the EIS and the Amended DA described in this document. The supporting Noise Assessment undertaken for the revised Project is included in Appendix B3 with an updated Visual Impact analysis provided in Section 5 of this document.

| Residence Landowner | | Agreement | Distance to Nearest Wind Turbine (km) | | EIS | /isual | Ame | | Noise | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ID | Status | Status | Amended DA | Increase from EIS | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Change in Situation | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Compliance Achieved |
| BAN100 | Host | Agreed | 0.5 | 0 | High | - | No Change | - | - | No |
| BAN032 | Host | Agreed | 1 | 0 | Low to Medium | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN101 | Neighbour | Agreed | 1.1 | 0 | High | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN041 | Ex-Host | Pending | 1.2 | 0.5 | Low to Medium | - | Five wind turbine sites removed from north of Mount Buffalo cluster | Low to Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN115 | Neighbour | Agreed | 1.4 | 0 | High | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN155 | Neighbour | Agreed | 1.4 | 0 | High | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN087 | Host | Agreed | 1.5 | 0 | Medium to High | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN136 | Neighbour | Agreed | 1.5 | 0 | High | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN021 | Host | Agreed | 1.7 | 0 | Medium | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN117 | Host | Agreed | 1.7 | 0 | Medium to High | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |

Table 6: Updated Residence Summary, including revised proximity and status

| Residence Landown | | r Agreement | Distance to Nearest Wind Turbine (km) | | EIS | Visual | Amended DA Visual | | | Noise |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ID | Status | Status | Amended DA | Increase from EIS | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Change in Situation | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Compliance Achieved |
| BAN238 | Neighbour | Consultation in progress | 1.8 | 0.8 | Medium | - | Three wind turbine sites removed (in addition to four previously removed) from south of Mount Buffalo cluster | Low | - | No |
| BAN154 | Neighbour | Agreed | 1.9 | 0 | High | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN235 | Neighbour | Declined | 1.9 | 0.2 | High | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster and three wind turbine sites removed (in addition to four previously) from south of Mount Buffalo cluster | High | - | Yes |
| BAN020 | Ex-Host | Pending | 2.1 | 0.5 | Low to Medium | - | Two wind turbine sites removed from north of Kangiara cluster | Low to Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN076 | Neighbour | Declined | 2.1 | 0.2 | Medium | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster and three wind turbine sites removed (in addition to four previously) from south of Mount Buffalo cluster | Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN158 | Neighbour | Agreed | 2.1 | 0 | Medium | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN189 | Host | Agreed | 2.2 | 0 | Low | - | Langs Creek cluster removed | Low | - | Yes |
| BAN282 | Neighbour | Declined | 2.2 | 0.5 | High | - | Two wind turbine sites removed from north of Kangiara cluster | Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN162 | Host | Agreed | 2.3 | 0 | Low | - | Langs Creek cluster removed | Low | - | Yes |

2017

| Residence | Landowner | Agreement | Distan Nearest | t Wind | EIS | Visual | Amended DA Visual | | | Noise |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ID | Status | Status | Amended DA | Increase from EIS | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Change in Situation | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Compliance Achieved |
| BAN144 | Neighbour | Declined | 2.5 | 0 | Low | - | Three wind turbine sites removed (in addition to four previously removed) from south of Mount Buffalo cluster | Low | - | Yes |
| BAN173 | Host | Agreed | 2.5 | 0 | Low | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN152 | Neighbour | Agreed | 2.6 | 0 | Low to Medium | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN060 | Neighbour | Declined | 2.7 | 0.3 | Medium | - | Three wind turbine sites removed (in addition to four previously removed) from south of Mount Buffalo cluster | Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN170 | Neighbour | Consultation in progress | 2.8 | 0 | Nil/Low | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN260 | Neighbour | Consultation in progress | 2.8 | 0.8 | Medium to High | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Medium to High | - | Yes |
| BAN062 | Neighbour | Consultation in progress | 2.9 | 0.8 | Medium to High | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Medium to High | - | Yes |
| BAN0179 | Neighbour | Consultation in progress | 2.9 | 0.3 | Low | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Low | - | Yes |
| BAN142 | Neighbour | Consultation in progress | 3.0 | 1 | Low | - | Five wind turbine sites removed from north of Mount Buffalo cluster and two wind turbine sites removed from north of Kangiara cluster | Low (possibly Nil) | - | Yes |
| BAN108 | Ex-Host | Consultation in progress | 3.1 | 0.7 | Low to Medium | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Low to Medium | - | Yes |

| Residence Landowner Agree | | Agreement | Distance Nearest V greement Turbine (| | ance to est Wind EIS Visual ine (km) | | Amended DA Visual | | | Noise |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ID | Status | Status | Amended DA | Increase from EIS | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Change in Situation | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Compliance Achieved |
| BAN182 | Ex-Host | Consultation in progress | 3.1 | 0.7 | Low to Medium | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Low to Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN243 | Neighbour | Consultation in progress | 3.2 | 0 | Low | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN026 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.3 | 0 | Low to Medium | - | Three wind turbine sites removed (in addition to four previously removed) from south of Mount Buffalo cluster | Low to Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN035 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.3 | 0.2 | Low | Nil to low | Five wind turbine sites removed from north of Mount Buffalo cluster | Low | Nil to Low | Yes |
| BAN042 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.3 | 0.8 | Nil/Low | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Nil/Low | - | Yes |
| BAN106 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.3 | 0 | Low | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN187 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.3 | 0.8 | Nil/low | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Nil/Low | - | Yes |
| BAN166 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.4 | 0 | Low to Medium | - | Three wind turbine sites removed (in addition to four previously removed) from south of Mount Buffalo cluster | Low to Medium | - | Yes |
| BAN181 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.4 | 0.8 | Nil/Low | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Nil/Low | - | Yes |
| BAN055 | Host | Agreed | 3.5 | 0 | Low | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN138 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.6 | 0.3 | Low | - | No Change | Low | - | Yes |

| Residence | Distance to Nearest Wind EIS Visual Amended DA Visual nce Landowner Agreement Turbine (km) | | | | Noise | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ID | Status | Status | Amended DA | Increase from EIS | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Change in Situation | Visual Significance Rating | Cumulative Visual Impact Rating | Compliance Achieved |
| BAN176 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.6 | 0.6 | Low | - | Two wind turbine sites removed from north of Kangiara cluster | Low | - | Yes |
| BAN126 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.7 | 0.7 | Nil/Low | - | No Change | Nil/Low | - | Yes |
| BAN177 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.7 | 0.1 | Low | - | Three wind turbine sites removed from south of Kangiara cluster | Low | - | Yes |
| BAN043 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.8 | 0 | Nil/Low | - | No Change | - | - | Yes |
| BAN160 | Host | Agreed | 3.8 | 2.1 | Medium to High | - | Langs Creek cluster removed | Low (possibly Nil) | - | Yes |
| BAN048 | Neighbour | None proposed | 3.9 | 1 | Low | Low to Medium | Five wind turbine sites removed from north of Mount Buffalo cluster | Low | Low | Yes |
| BAN096 | Host | Agreed | 3.9 | 2.1 | Low | - | Langs Creek cluster removed | Low (possibly Nil) | - | Yes |
| BAN225 | Host | Agreed | 3.9 | 2.9 | High | - | Langs Creek cluster removed | Low (possibly Nil) | - | Yes |

Wind turbine locations have been removed from the original Project in response to community input raised during the public exhibition of the EIS. Table 7 summarises these changes.

| Residence / Locality with initial concern | Modification response | Distance from EIS Layout | EIS Visual significance rating | Distance from Modified Layout | Revised Visual Significance rating |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Rye Park (Locality) | Removal of five turbines in the north-east of the Project | 4 km | NA | 5 km | NA |
| Kangiara (Locality) | Removal of three turbines in the south-west of the Project | 2 km | NA | 3 km | NA |
| Boorowa (Township) | Removal of 30 turbines in the north-west of the Project ³ | 7 km | NA | 12 km | NA |
| BAN238 "Brookdale" (Residence located to the south of the Mt Buffalo cluster) | Removal of three turbines in the south-east of the Project | 1.0 km | Medium | 1.8 km | Low |
| BAN282 (Residence located to the north of the Kangiara cluster) Removal of two turbines in the north of the Kangiara cluster | | 1.7 km | High | 2.2 km | Medium |

| Table 7: Modification response | e to community concerns |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|

Both BAN238 and BAN282 are new residences. Development Applications for both dwellings were lodged after the original Project layout was determined by the Proponent.

BAN282 was built 1.7 km from the nearest proposed turbine location and in the EIS LVIA was given a visual significance rating of 'high'. In consultation with the owners, there was an unwillingness to enter a Neighbour Agreement, but requested the removal of all turbines within 2 km of their dwelling. These turbines have been removed from the amended layouts and comparative wireframes are provided in Appendix A6.

BAN238 was built 1.0 km from the nearest proposed turbine location and given a visual significance rating of 'medium'. The owners have requested the removal of all turbines within 2.1 km of BAN238 (the additional 100 m is to ensure the turbines are outside 2 km given micro-siting allowances). This would include five turbine locations based on layout 1. Three of those five wind turbine locations have been removed from the amended layouts, and as a consequence the owners of BAN238 are open to discussions regarding the remaining turbines

³ Although these turbines were removed predominantly for the benefit of the Superb Parrot, there are other ramifications of this action including reduced visual impacts for some Boorowa residents.

Photomontage and wireframe locations are shown in Figure 11.



| | • | WTG Layout Reduced Layout 1 (75 WTGs) Removed Turbines | Other Access Track | BANGO | BANGO WIND FARM PTY LTD | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------|--|
| | * | Photomontage Location Wireframe Location | Unsealed Road Unsealed Road Sealed Road Sealed Road Use and Transmission Line Overhead Transmission Line UGB Roundary | TITLE | PHOTOMON | | IS | | |
| | | | LGA Boundary | 02 MAY 2017 | SCALE 1:69000 | DWG NO BAN-144 | REV | VER 1 | |
| SCALE BAR | | o | 4 km | B KRONENBERG | CHECKED BY K OLD | SHEET 1 OF 1 | јов NO 080811 | SIZE A3 | |

Figure 11: Photomontage and wireframe locations map

Other Visual Impact Reductions

The removal of the 43 turbine locations for layout option 1 (31 turbines for layout option 2) has had the additional effect of reducing visual impacts for other residences within 4 km of the Project area. The following commentary addressees this by Project area. Photomontage and wireframe diagrams for key residences discussed are included in Appendices A5 and A6. Figure 11, indicates the location and direction from which each diagram is taken. Wireframe diagrams only take topography and wind turbines into account, they do not account for buildings and plants that may provide natural screening, so in the commentary the word 'potential' is used to describe views of wind turbines that may or may not be visible from that location.

North east - The removal of the five wind turbine locations in the north of the Mt Buffalo cluster has reduced visual impacts for the following residences:

| Residence | Location | Distance from EIS Layout | EIS Visual significance rating | Distance from Modified Layout | Revised Visual Significance rating |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| BAN142 "Medways" | Residence to the north of Mt Buffalo cluster | 2.0 km | Low | 3.0 km | Low (possibly Nil) |
| BAN048 "Glenwood" | Residence located along Dalton Road, near Hillview Lane | 2.9 km | Low | 3.9 km | Low |
| BAN035 "Stonehaven" | Residence located north-east of the Mt Buffalo cluster along Wargeila Road | 3.1 km | Low | 3.3 km | Low |
| BAN141 "Bankside" | Residence located north of the Mt Buffalo cluster on Tangmangaroo Rd | 3.0 km | Low to Medium | 4.6 km | Not re- assessed |
| BAN243 ⁴ "Kywong" | Residence located east of the Mt Buffalo cluster along Wargeila Road | 3.2 km | Low | 3.2 km | Low |
| BAN152 "Eversleigh" | Residence located east of the Mt Buffalo cluster along Wargeila Road | 2.6 km | Low to Medium | 2.6 km | Low to Medium |
| BAN170 "Back Creek" | Residence located between Kangiara and Mt Buffalo cluster along Tangmangaroo Road | 2.8 km | Nil to Low | 2.8 km | Nil to Low |

Table 8: Non-involved residences impacted by removal of turbines in the north east

BAN142, BAN048 and BAN035 benefit from the removal of five wind turbine sites from the north of the Mt Buffalo cluster, with increased separation distances between the Project and each residence. Consultation with

⁴ BAN190 has previously been mis-identified as this residence. Further investigation has shown that BAN190 is a shed and BAN243 is the residence at Kwyong.

each owner has indicated this is a positive outcome and acted toward resolving their initial concerns with the Project.

(Additionally, residence BAN142 benefits from the removal of the two turbines in the north of the Kangiara cluster, which were potentially visible from the curtilage of this property.)

BAN141 had a previous visual significance rating of Low to Medium, however with the removal of five wind turbine sites from the north of the Mt Buffalo cluster, the residence is now located at 4.6 km from the closest wind turbine location (an increase of 1.6 km) and therefore the impacts have been considered to be sufficiently reduced.

For a comparison of the Amended DA layout with those proposed in the EIS, refer to the photomontage from Rye Park within Appendix A5.

Five turbines have been removed from the potential views from BAN243 and BAN152, but overall visual impacts have not significantly changed with the revised layout. Discussions with BAN243 have revealed that they have apprehension about the Project as a whole, but are not particularly concerned about the visual impact on their property. Consultation with this landowner is ongoing. Residents from BAN152 have submitted a letter to the Proponent stating that they are not concerned about the Bango wind farm, or the vicinity of wind turbines to their property (supplied separately to the DPE). For an indication of the reduced visual impact, please see the wireframe from BAN152 in Appendix A6.

BAN170 is nestled among trees between the Mt Buffalo and Kangiara clusters. Owing to local topography and foliage, the visual impact of the turbines here is very low, both before and after the layout changes. Although the overall setback distance has not changed, seven turbines in the region of this residence have been removed from the amended layouts.

South east - The removal of three wind turbine locations in the south of the Mt Buffalo cluster, in addition to four wind turbine locations removed prior to EIS public exhibition, has reduced visual impacts for the following residences (as well as for BAN238, as discussed earlier):

| Residence | Location | Distance from EIS Layout | EIS Visual significance rating | Distance from Modified Layout | Revised Visual Significance rating |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| BAN060 "Montalta" | Residence located to the south east of the Mt Buffalo cluster | 2.4 km | Medium | 2.7 km | Medium |
| BAN144 "Letona" | Residence located to the east of the Mt Buffalo cluster | 2.4 km | Low | 2.5 km | Low |
| BAN166 "Mountainview" | Residence located to the east of the Mt Buffalo cluster | 3.4 km | Low to Medium | 3.4 km | Low to Medium |
| BAN235 "Laverstock Cottage" | Residence located to the south of the Kangiara cluster | 1.7 km (Kangiara Cluster) | High | 1.9 km (Kangiara Cluster) | High |
| BAN076 "Laverstock" | Residence located to the south of the Kangiara cluster | 1.9 km (Kangiara Cluster) | Medium | 2.1 km (Kangiara Cluster) | Medium |

| Table 9: Non-involved residences im | npacted by remova | l of turbines in the | south east |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------|
| | | | |

BAN060 benefit from the removal of the three additional wind turbine sites from the south of the Mt Buffalo cluster, with increased separation distances (0.3 km) between the Project and the residence. Wireframes depicting the reduction in visual impact for this residence can be seen in Appendix A6, and clearly indicates how the angle of turbine visibility has been reduced.

Similar impacts can be observed at BAN144 (wireframes for this dwelling are also found in Appendix A6), however because this property is located further north, the action of removing wind turbine locations from the Project layouts is more effective in reducing the angle of visibility of the wind turbines (i.e. views from the west to the south west no longer contain proposed wind turbine locations). Moreover, in accordance with the wireframe analysis, BAN144 also had potential views of three Kangiara turbines, and very distant potential views of Langs Creek, which have been removed from the amended layouts.

As a result of the proposed changes, BAN166 is now approximately 1 km further away from the wind turbine locations in the south of the Mt Buffalo cluster, noting the closest wind turbine locations to BAN166 remain those within the Kangiara cluster. As such, the removal of seven turbines to the south east and removal of three turbines to the north west have both contributed to a reduced visual impact on this dwelling, which can be evaluated from the wireframes from this dwelling location, included in Appendix A6.

Residences BAN235 and BAN076 are located at the south of the Kangiara cluster. Photomontages from both dwelling locations are provided in Appendix A5. Both dwellings have a distant view of the Mt Buffalo cluster of wind turbines, but also a potential view of the wind turbines in the Kangiara cluster. The removal of seven wind turbine locations from the southern end of the Mt Buffalo cluster reduces the viewing angle in which turbines

are visible from these dwellings, and moreover reduces the number of wind turbine locations within that view. It should be noted that the Mt Buffalo turbines are located 6 km and more from these residences, and to make a meaningful change to the proposed layouts in consideration of this aspect of the visual impact would be of considerable detriment to the Project.

South west - The removal of three wind turbine locations in the south west of the Kangiara cluster has reduced visual impacts for the following residences:

| Residence | Location | Distance from EIS Layout | EIS Visual significance rating | Distance from Modified Layout | Revised Visual Significance rating |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| BAN235 "Laverstock Cottage" | Residence located to the south of the Kangiara cluster | 1.7 km | High | 1.9 km | High |
| BAN076 "Laverstock" | Residence located to the south of the Kangiara cluster | 1.9 km | Medium | 2.1 km | Medium |
| BAN260 | Residence located within Kangiara | 2.0 km | Medium/High | 2.8 km | Medium/High |
| BAN062 "Humeview" | Residence located within Kangiara | 2.1 km | Medium/High | 2.9 km | Medium/High |
| BAN181 "Long Gully" | Residence located within Kangiara | 2.6 km | Nil/Low | 3.4 km | Nil/Low |
| BAN166 "Mountainview" | Residence located to the east of the Mt Buffalo cluster | 3.4 km | Low to Medium | 3.4 km | Low to Medium |
| BAN179 "Ingleside" | Residence located to the south of the Kangiara cluster | idence located he south of the 2.6 km ngiara cluster | | 2.9 km | Low |

Table 10: Non-involved residences impacted by removal of turbines in the south west

Impacts for BAN076, BAN235 and BAN166 are discussed in the previous paragraph, with photomontages and wireframes for all included in Appendices A5 and A6.

BAN260, BAN062 and BAN181 are located within Kangiara. Existing foliage in Kangiara already provides screening for its residents, and the removal of three wind turbine locations provides increased setback distances for these properties. Wireframe analysis from BAN260 (see Appendix A6) indicates that the wind turbine locations in the south of Mt Buffalo and in Langs Creek, although distant, were potentially visible from this area, and so their removal significantly reduces the potential viewing angle of turbines from these dwellings.

BAN179 is located further away from the Kangiara cluster, towardsBAN235 and BAN076. There are no views of Mt Buffalo from this residence, and likely only very few turbines from the Kangiara cluster visible due to the local flora and topography. The removal of three wind turbine locations from this cluster may reduce the number of nacelles visible from this residence.

North west - The removal of 30 wind turbine locations from the Langs Creek cluster has reduced visual impacts for the following residences:

| Residence | Location | Distance from EIS Layout | EIS Visual significance rating | Distance from Modified Layout | Revised Visual Significance rating | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| BAN034 "Dover's Flat" | Residence located to the east of the Langs Creek cluster | 2.1 km | Low | 6.4 km | Not re- assessed | |
| BAN176 "Sunbury" | BAN176 Sunbury"Residence located north of the Kangiara cluster3.0 kmLowBAN066 Armidale"Residence located to the north of the Langs Creek cluster2.7 kmLow | | Low | 3.6 km | Low | |
| BAN066 "Armidale" | | | Low | 7.6 km | Not re- assessed | |
| BAN019 "Glenorie" | Residence located to the north of the Langs Creek cluster | 2.5 km | Low to Medium | 6.5 km | Not re- assessed | |

Table 11: Non-involved residences impacted by removal of turbines in the north west

The removal of the Langs Creek cluster has significantly reduced the visual impacts to these residences due to the much-increased setback distance from the remaining wind turbine locations. A review of photomontages PM1 and PM6 from the LVIA in the EIS reveals the reduced impact on these locations as none of the turbines in PM1 are now proposed, in addition to, the wind turbines shown in the foreground of PM6, located west of Hopefield Lane (Langs Creek). Inspection of the wireframe from BAN282 in (Appendix A6) also provides an indication of the reduced visual impacts in this area of the project.

For BAN176, the removal of the two turbines to the north of the Kangiara cluster has further increased setback distances. This is also the case for BAN066 and BAN019, but their setback distances are much greater.

North of Kangiara cluster - The removal of two wind turbine locations from the northern end of the Kangiara cluster has reduced visual impacts for the following residences:

| Residence | Location | Distance from EIS Layout | EIS Visual significance rating | Distance from Modified Layout | Revised Visual Significance rating |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| BAN142 "Medways" | Residence to the north of Mt Buffalo cluster | 2.0 km | Low | 3.0 km | Low (possily Nil) |
| BAN176 "Sunbury" | Residence located north of the Kangiara cluster | sidence located north of the 3.0 km Low 3.6 km angiara cluster | | 3.6 km | Low |
| BAN066 "Armidale" | Residence located to the north of the Langs Creek cluster | 2.7 km | Low | 7.6 km | Not re- assessed |
| BAN019 "Glenorie" | Residence located to the north of the Langs Creek cluster | 2.5 km | Low to Medium | 6.5 km | Not re- assessed |

Table 12: Non-involved residence impacted by removal of northern of Kangiara turbines

The reduced impacts to these residences have been discussed in previous paragraphs of this section. The wind turbine locations removed in this area of the Project were to be the closest turbines to BAN176, increasing the setback distance by 0.6 km. BAN176, BAN066 and BAN019 were part of the discussion from the removal of the Langs Creek cluster in the north west. BAN142 was discussed in the commentary on the north-east area of the Project.

Previous Host Landowners - One consequence of the reduced layout is that five landowners who were previously to host turbines will no longer be hosts. Impacts to these residents are summarised in Table 13. Agreements are being sought with these landowners.

| Dwolling ID | Cluster | Distance to Turbines (km) | | Revised Assessment | | | |
|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|
| Dweining ID | Cluster | EIS | Revised | Noise | Visual | Shadow flicker (hrs) | |
| BAN009 | Langs Creek | 1.4 | 5.4 | Meets Criteria | Not re-assessed | 0 | |
| BAN020 | Kangiara | 1.6 | 2.1 | Meets Criteria Low to Medium | | 0 | |
| BAN041 | Mt Buffalo | 0.7 | 1.2 | Meets Criteria | Low to Medium | 0 | |
| BAN108/182 | Kangiara | 2.4 | 3.1 | Meets Criteria | Low to Medium | 0 | |
| BAN119 | Langs Creek | 0.9 | 4.1 | Meets Criteria | Not re-assessed | 0 | |

Table 13: Residual impact on previous host landowners

BAN041 is located within 2 km of the project. The removal of the five wind turbine locations from this property has significantly increased the setback distance and reduced the visual impacts at this location, but there are still a number of turbines potentially visible from this dwelling, as is shown in the wireframe diagram in Appendix A6. As such, the Proponent is seeking a Neighbour Agreement with this landowner, who has provided a letter declaring that they have no objection to the approval or subsequent construction of the Proposal, provided that a suitable Neighbour Agreement can be reached with Bango Wind Farm.

BAN020 will be outside of 2 km from the Project, and has a lower visual impact compared to BAN041, but is in a comparable situation. Wireframes from this location are also included in Appendix A6. This landowner has also provided a letter of support. These letters have been provided to the Department.

Shadow Flicker - From inspection of Figure 12, it is possible to clearly identify which turbines cause associated bands of shadow flicker on surrounding areas. With the removal of 43 turbines from the Bango Layout 1, (circled in red) it can be seen that dwellings that were previously predicted to experience some shadow flicker, have reduced impacts (see Table 14).



Figure 12: Shadow Flicker diagram from EIS LVIA

| Dwelling | Nearest Cluster | Status | Residual Impact |
|----------|-----------------|-----------|---|
| BAN009 | Langs Creek | Ex-host | No shadow flicker |
| BAN119 | Langs Creek | Ex-host | No shadow flicker |
| BAN225 | Langs Creek | Involved | No shadow flicker |
| BAN041 | Mt Buffalo | Ex-host | No shadow flicker |
| BAN160 | Langs Creek | Involved | No longer close to shadow flicker bands |
| BAN238 | Mt Buffalo | Neighbour | No longer close to shadow flicker bands |
| BAN155 | Kangiara | Involved | Potential reduction of shadow flicker |
| BAN101 | Kangiara | Involved | No change in shadow flicker |
| BAN032 | Mt Buffalo | Involved | No change in shadow flicker |
| BAN100 | Mt Buffalo | Involved | No change in shadow flicker |

Table 14: Changes to Shadow Flicker Assessment

Residual impact additional information

No shadow flicker: These are residence locations that were predicted to be affected by shadow flicker from the Bango wind farm that will no longer experience these effects due to the removal of turbines from the layout.

No longer close to shadow flicker bands: These are residence locations located within 400 m of an area affected by shadow flicker predicted from turbines, that have now been removed from the layout. These are included because the potential for shadow flicker immediately surrounding the dwelling has been removed.

Potential reduction of shadow flicker: These are residence locations where it is possible that the removal of turbines has reduced the duration of shadow flicker, but some shadow flicker is still likely to occur.

No change in shadow flicker: These are residence locations where the reduction in layout will not change the shadow flicker assessment.

6. Residual Impact Assessment

A residual impact assessment was undertaken across remaining aspects of the development and summarised below in Table 15. Associated technical assessments included in Appendix B.

| Aspect | Key element(s) of the Amendment | Consideration of change in impact | Summary of findings / recommendations |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| Noise | Turbine model sound power profile | Impacts associated with the re-correlation of sound power outputs with 100 m wind data and amended layouts have been considered by noise consultants Sonus. A comprehensive report is provided in Appendix B. | The reduced layout has had the effect of reducing the sound power levels at most dwellings. The re-correlation of data to recorded wind speeds at 100 m AGL has changed the resultant sound power level predictions for most dwelling locations. The change is not a simple increase or decrease, but in general, noise level predictions for lower wind speeds have increased while noise level predictions at higher wind speeds have decreased. There remains two dwelling locations where predicted noise levels exceed the allowable criteria. BAN100 is an uninhabited dwelling belonging to a host landowner. BAN238 is an inhabited dwelling belonging to a neighbouring landowner with whom a Neighbour Agreement is being sought. BAN020 and BAN041 are 2.1 and 1.2 km (respectively) from the nearest turbine, belong to ex-host landowners and are associated through a (pending) agreement. Regardless of these involvement status changes, BAN020 and BAN041 comply with noise criteria. |
| Flora and Fauna | Reduced Development Footprint Revised transport plan | Proposed impacts have been considered by ecology consultants ERM Australia. A comprehensive assessment is provided in Appendix B2. | The Amended DA will: reduce the area of potential habitat loss for the Golden Sun Moth from 100.9 ha to 39.4 ha; reduce the area of potential habitat loss for the Regent Honeyeater and the Swift Parrot from 6.58 ha to 4.77 ha; reduce the cumulative 'swept area' of turbine rotors (and hence the risk of blade strike) from 1.922M m² to 1.221M m² (36 % reduction); remove the need for and disturbance of habitat along Hillview and Hopefield Lanes; and, reduce disturbance along Wargeila and Tangmangaroo roads. In summary, the modification will result in an overall reduction of direct and indirect |

Table 15: Residual Impact Assessment

| | | | impacts to biodiversity values in the Project area. |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Aviation | Reduced Development Footprint | Updated correspondence with AirServices Australia | Airspace Procedures With respect to procedures designed by Airservices in accordance with ICAO PANS- OPS and Document 9905, at a maximum tip height of 952m (3124ft) AHD, the wind farm will not affect any sector or circling altitude, nor any instrument approach or departure procedure at Young Airport. The wind farm will also not affect any air routes. Note that procedures not designed by Airservices at Young Airport were not considered in this assessment. |
| | | | Communications/Navigation/Surveillance (CNS) Facilities Based on the supplied 170320_BAN_200m WTG tip heights.docx (attached), the Bango Wind Farm to a maximum wind turbine tip height of 952m (3124ft) AHD will not adversely impact the performance of Airservices Precision/Non-Precision Nav Aids, HF/VHF Comms, A-SMGCS, Radar, PRM, ADS-B, WAM or Satellite/Links. |
| Cultural Heritage | Reduced Development Footprint | Reduced Development Footprint considered by NSW Archaeology | Received confirmation that "the project layout put forward in the Amended DA is consistent with what was assessed previously. Accordingly, the conclusions previously reached in the Heritage Assessment remain valid, to the extent they apply to the reduced foot print." Refer to Appendix B7. |
| Communications | Reduced Development Footprint | No change | No change |
| Mineral Resources | Consultation | Heron Resources Ltd is a mineral exploration and development company. Heron is a stakeholder in the Bango Wind Farm project through its subsidiary, Ochre Resources, and its title Exploration Licence (EL) 8400 for the 'Kangiara Project', which falls within the Bango Wind Farm project area. Heron Resources has expressed concern that the Proponent has not adequately consulted with | It has been recognised that although an attempt was made in 2014, it appears the letter was never received a follow up was not made by the Proponent. As a result, Heron/Ochre Resources did not make a submission in response to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) during the exhibition period. In January this year, Ochre Resources was made aware of the Bango wind farm. The parties have been in consultation and have agreed to continue two-way consultation on the Projects' respective progress. Ochre are in preliminary stages of exploration and feel they will have a better understanding of whether they will progress exploration in the coming months. From the |

| | them or Ochre Resources, | perspective of the Bango wind farm, the |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| | regarding the overlap of | area of overlap does affect a number of |
| | the Bango wind farm | turbines, but it does not jeopardise the |
| | project area and their | entire project. As there is still a high degree |
| | Exploration Licence 8400. | of uncertainty around the mineral value of |
| | The Proponent made | the land, CWP Renewables plan to continue |
| | attempts to contact Ochre | Bango wind farm development as before, in |
| | Resources in March 2014 | consultation with Ochre Resources. |
| | to open the conversation | |
| | on this issue, but received | |
| | no response. This | |
| | exchange has been | |
| | referenced in Table 6.9, | |
| | page 134, of the EIS Main | |
| | Report, with further | |
| | discussion in section 19.2 | |
| | of the same report. | |
| | | |

The Statement of Commitments (SoC) is a summary of all management and mitigation measures collated from chapters of the EIS and Amended DA. The SoCs have been developed to inform Development Consent Conditions of Approval which are to be managed through an Environmental Management System and sub-plans as the Project is constructed and operated.

Table 15 provides a summary of environmental aspects identified in undertaking the EIS and Amended DA. Each aspect is defined by an impact, objective, a proposed mitigation measure and the responsible party. Each aspect is further defined by Project stage, for the purposes of informing Development Consent Conditions of Approval. Stage timing is defined by the following:

- Pre-Construction (PC);
- Construction (C);
- Operation / Maintenance (OM); and
- Refurbishment / Decommissioning (RD).

To enable ease of referencing to chapters the SoC mitigation measures have been split into the associated EIS chapters.

| | lunnant | Ohiastiva | Mitigation Massure | Deenensihilitu | Stage | | Stage | |
|------|------------------------|-----------------|---|---|-------|---|-------|----|
| | impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| Man | agement Plans | | | | | | | |
| 001 | Environmental | Minimise impact | An EMS will be developed which outlines environmental practices and procedures to be followed during construction. | Proponent | ✓ | ~ | | ✓ |
| 002 | Environmental | Minimise impact | An EMS will be developed, which outlines environmental management practices and procedures that are to be followed during operation. | Proponent | | | ✓ | |
| Land | scape and Visual | | | | | | | |
| 003 | Impact to receptors | Minimise impact | Use of a matt and / or off-white finish on the structures to reduce visual contrast between wind turbine structures and the viewing background (this is subject to final wind turbine selection and aviation safety requirements); Limit amount of advertising, signs or logos mounted on wind turbine structures, except those required for safety purposes; and Where feasible select materials and colours for ancillary structures with consideration of reflective properties. If aviation lighting is required, the Proponent will commit to shielding | Proponent in | V | | | |
| 004 | receptors | winninge impact | provisions allowed under existing CASA guidelines. Shielding restricts the downward component of light to 5 % of nominal intensity emitted below 5° below horizontal and zero light emission below 10° below horizontal. | consultation with CASA | √ | | | |
| 005 | Impact to receptors | Minimise impact | Reinstate disturbed soil areas closely after completion of construction and decommissioning, where practicable, including recontouring and re-seeding with appropriate plant species and local materials where feasible; Where practicable use local materials to reconstitute disturbed areas to minimise colour contrast; Enforce safeguards to control and minimise dust emissions during construction and decommissioning; and Limit the height of stockpiles to minimise visibility from outside the Project. | Proponent in consultation with contractor | | • | | ¥ |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Massura | Posponsibility | | Posnonsihility | | Sta | Stage | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|----|----------------|----|-----|-------|--|--|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD | | | |
| 006 | Impact to receptors | Minimise impact | Where visual impacts at non-involved residences have been determined to be Medium, Medium to High or High the Proponent will offer visual impact mitigation to the owner during the construction phase based on the final Project layout. Alternatively, Neighbour Agreements will also be discussed with the relevant residences. | Proponent | | ~ | ✓ | | | | |
| 006 | Impact to receptors | Minimise impact | Except for emergencies, minimise activities that may require night time lighting and, if necessary, use low lux (intensity) lighting designed to be mounted with the light projecting inwards to the Project site to minimise glare. | Proponent in consultation with contractor | | ✓ | ~ | √ | | | |
| Noise | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 007 | Impact to receptors | Compliance | Predicted operational noise levels of chosen wind turbine model (including any micro-siting of the layout) are to comply with relevant criteria. | Proponent in consultation with noise consultant, and where applicable, EPA and landowners | ~ | | | | | | |
| 008 | Construction noise exceedance | Minimisation | Where practicable, construction is to occur within recommended working hours. Wind turbine erection and concrete pours to be permitted outside of these set hours where climatic conditions are favourable to ensure construction program is maintained. (Protocol to be provided within EMS or sub-plan). | Proponent in consultation with DPE | | ~ | | ~ | | | |
| 009 | Construction noise exceedance | Minimisation | Prior notification of affected public and restricted use of exhaust / engine brakes in built up areas for night-time deliveries. (Protocol to be provided within EMS or sub-plan). | Proponent | | ~ | | ~ | | | |

010 Substation noise Compliance If selected substation locations are non-compliant with the NSW exceedance Industrial Noise Policy, mitigation measures would be applied as appropriate, including; The use of transformer(s) with a lower sound power level output; ٠ Landscaping, including raised embankments and vegetation, around ٠ the substation; and Providing acoustic upgrades (glazing, façade, masking noise etc) to • affected residences. 011 Wind turbine Compliance If, during operation, wind turbine noise impacts are non-compliant with stated criteria used for the assessment, then an 'adaptive management' operational noise exceedance approach (protocol to be provided within EMS or sub-plan) can be implemented to mitigate or remove the impact. This process could include: Investigating the nature of the reported impact; ٠ Identifying exactly what conditions or times lead to undue impacts; Consideration of operating wind turbines in a reduced 'noise ٠ optimised' mode during offending wind directions and at night-time (sector management);

Objective

affected residences; and Turning off wind turbines that are identified as causing the undue • impact. weeds present at the Project site and on ways to prevent spread; landowners

| Ecolo | gy | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 012 | Spread of weeds | Minimise spread | An EMS sub-plan will be developed, which includes: | Proponent in | | | |
| | | | Soil which may contain exotic species to be piled at least 50 m from any water source, or areas of native vegetation; | consultation with ecologist and | √ | ✓ | |
| | | | All construction staff and sub-contractors to be educated on noxious weeds present at the Project site and on ways to prevent spread; | associated | | | |

• Providing acoustic upgrades (glazing, façade, masking noise etc) to

Mitigation Measure

Impact

С

✓

PC

Responsibility

Proponent

Proponent in

and where

consultation with

noise consultant,

applicable, EPA and landowners Stage

OM

 \checkmark

RD

| | luna a at | Ohiostivo | Mitigation Massure | Doononsihilitu | | Sta | age | |
|-----|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|----|-----|-----|----|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Weasure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| | | | Where a specific weed risk has been identified, all machinery, equipment and vehicles are to be washed down before entry and egress of the Project site; Where practicable, topsoil in areas that have a high proportion of native vegetation and is limited in weeds to be harvested to salvage the native soil seed bank and reintroduced into disturbed areas. Otherwise, revegetate with locally native endemic species characteristic of the cleared vegetation type; Control of perennial weed grasses within the disturbance zone for three to five years after construction; Where practicable, and in consultation with host landowners, manage stock access during periods of revegetation; and Imported soil and rubble to be certified as free of weeds and weed seeds. | | | | | |
| 013 | Loss of biodiversity value | Minimise impact | An EMS sub-plan will be developed, which includes: All site staff are to be inducted on the procedures of the EMS sub-plan in relation to flora and fauna; Where practicable, Project vehicles are to remain within the extent of the earth works designed specifically for the Project to minimise vegetation disturbance; Laydown or temporary disturbance areas will be sited in already disturbed areas where practicable to avoid any unnecessary clearing of native vegetation and habitat; Where practicable, and in consultation with host landowners, logs and large rocks removed from within the proposed development area are to be redistributed following the completion of works in temporary clearance areas or adjacent areas to supplement habitat; Where practicable, trenches to be dug at least 15 m away from the base of trees and outside drip lines; Native vegetation that is removed will be chipped and mulched for on-site use where practicable; Native vegetation greater than 3 m in height to be retained during transmission line construction where practicable: | Proponent in consultation with ecologist, OEH and DoE | ✓ | ~ | ✓ | ✓ |

| | Immediate | Ohiostivo | Mitigation Measure Res | Desnonsihilitu | | St | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|----|----|----|----|
| | impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| | | | Minimise dust creation during construction through the use of water carts; If micro-siting of the Development Footprint occurs, where practicable, maintain a 30 m buffer between all turbines and hollowbearing trees; Boundaries of the construction area are to be clearly identified within EMS sub-plans, and where practicable on the ground, to prevent breaches of construction boundaries; Outside of the Development Footprint tree clearance will be avoided where practicable; Rehabilitation of internal access roads that are not required following construction to be undertaken; and Landscaping around the main collector and switching substation sites is to incorporate native species where appropriate. | | | | | |
| 014 | Loss of biodiversity value | Minimise impact | An appropriate offset package will be secured within 12 months of commencing construction to compensate for the loss of habitat within the Study Area outlined within this Amended DA. Final calculation of the offset area will be carried out during the pre-construction phase once wind turbine selection has taken place and the final Development Footprint is known. | Proponent in consultation with ecologist, OEH, DoE and associated land owners | ~ | | | |
| 015 | Habitat Loss – Golden Sun Moth | Minimise impact | An EMS sub-plan will be developed to include specific measures to address loss of habitat for Golden Sun Moth (GSM). Measures include: Disturbance to mapped GSM habitat will be minimised during the flying period, from November to January, if possible; Areas of habitat will be delineated by barrier tape (or similar) to clearly demarcate these areas and limit risk of vehicles traversing through habitat accidently; and All vehicle movements will be contained to roads and tracks where possible. | Proponent in consultation with ecologist, OEH and DoE | ¥ | V | • | ✓ |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Posponsibility | | Sta | age | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|----|-----|-----|----|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Weasure | Responsibility | РС | С | ОМ | RD |
| 016 | Habitat Loss – Box-Gum Woodland | Minimise and manage impact | An EMS sub-plan will be developed to include specific measures to address loss of habitat for Box-Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland (DNG). Measures include: Where micro-siting of transmission lines and easements is to occur, impacts are to be minimised by siting in areas that are already cleared for existing driveways and access gates where possible; Where hollow bearing trees are removed, the material will be placed in adjacent habitat, where practicable in consultation with landowners; Clearing will be restricted to the canopy and mid-storey; and Remaining Box-Gum Grassy Woodland areas (including areas of DNG) will be delineated by barrier tape (or similar) to clearly demarcate these areas and limit the risk of vehicles or machinery causing damage to these areas. | Proponent in consultation with ecologist, OEH, DoE and associated land owners | ¥ | ¥ | ¥ | V |
| 017 | Fauna Mortality | Pre-clearance protocol | An EMS sub-plan will be developed to include specific measures to minimise fauna mortality. Measures include: Designing a pre-clearance protocol to manage the removal of fauna from hollow-bearing trees; Undertaking pre-clearance surveys to determine if roosts, nests or dens are present in any hollow-bearing trees; An Environmental Compliance Manager or field officer qualified in the handling of fauna to be present on-site during clearing of hollow-bearing trees to capture and re-release fauna, where appropriate; A trench monitoring protocol will be prepared and implemented to rescue trapped fauna; Where practicable, fencing to be erected along open trenches to prevent fauna falling in; and Management measures will be defined to reduce fauna mortality on roads and access tracks. | Proponent in consultation with ecologist, OEH and DoE | ¥ | ¥ | | ¥ |
| 018 | Erosion, Runoff and Dust | Manage impact | Erosion and sediment control measures to be included in an EMS sub- plan to limit runoff to adjacent habitat areas and watercourses. Details to | Proponent | ✓ | ✓ | ~ | ~ |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Posnonsihility. | | St | age | |
|-----|---|-----------------|--|--|----|----|-----|----|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Weasure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| | | | include devices to be installed, monitoring requirements and corrective actions. Management measures to include: | | | | | |
| | | | All erosion and sedimentation control devices regularly checked, cleared and repaired, particularly after periods of heavy rainfall; Rehabilitation and stabilisation methods to limit erosive and dust generation potential of earth areas exposed that are not required for permanent infrastructure; Disturbed soil surfaces should be stabilised as soon as practical after works have ceased in the area; Stockpiles will be covered, where practicable, to prevent the loss of material during high wind and rain events, and appropriate sediment barrier fencing will be used in areas to inhibit the flow of sediment into surrounding areas; and Stock pile locations will consider shelter from the wind where practical. | | | | | |
| 019 | Wind turbine Collisions or Barotrauma | Minimise impact | A specific Bird and Bat Adaptive Monitoring Plan (BBAMP) to be developed with the objective of minimising the impacts of the operational wind farm on threatened bird species. The BBAMP will include: | Proponent in consultation with OEH and, where applicable, DoE | | | | |
| | | | The required monitoring measures; Key thresholds for determining permissible impacts and corrective actions that are required in order to achieve the objectives of the plan; and The roles and responsibilities for the proponent, operator and agencies in implementing, assessing and enforcing the plan. The frequency of reporting strike data will be determined during the preparation of a monitoring program. Adaptive management measures that any low implemented on outle strike thresholds he reached will be | | ~ | V | ¥ | |
| | | | that could be implemented should strike thresholds be reached will be negotiated with OEH and DoE if significant strike rates are detected. Bird | | | | | |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Pocnoncibility | | St | age | |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|----|----|-----|----|
| | inipact | Objective | Witigation Measure | Responsibility | РС | С | ОМ | RD |
| | | | and bat strike monitoring will be undertaken with consideration of relevant monitoring guidelines. | | | | | |
| Cultu | ural Heritage | | | | | | | |
| 020 | Loss of cultural heritage items | Minimise impact | An EMS sub-plan will be developed within six months of planning approval with consideration of the list of mitigation and management strategies contained within sections 7 and 9 of Appendix 13 to the EIS. In summary, these include: The Proponent, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, relevant Aboriginal communities and OEH, developing a Cultural Heritage Management Protocol which provides procedures to be followed for impact avoidance and accidental discovery; Personnel involved in the construction and management phases of the Project trained by a qualified archaeologist in procedures to implement recommendations relating to cultural heritage, where necessary, to decrease impact. This training should include: Identification of Aboriginal objects and skeletal material; Aboriginal cultural awareness and Procedures to be followed during the life of the project; and Cultural heritage should be included within any environmental audit of impacts proposed to be undertaken during the construction phase of the development. Further, the following mitigation and management strategies are suggested to minimise the impact on Aboriginal objects and places: Ground disturbance impacts associated with the Project be kept to a minimum and to defined areas, to ensure minimum impact on Aboriginal objects, which can be expected to extend in a relatively continuous, albeit very low to low density distribution, across the broader landscape encompassed by the Project; It is recommended that additional archaeological assessments are to be carried out if any new impacts are to occur outside the Study area. | Proponent in consultation with OEH and where applicable, relevant Aboriginal communities | ✓ | ~ | ✓ | ✓ |

| | luuraat | Ohiaatiwa | Mitigation Measure F | Deenensihilitu | | St | age | |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|--|---|----|----|-----|----|
| | Impact | Objective | witigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| | | | If a significant Aboriginal object is identified, prior to impact, mitigation strategies will be implemented. It may be culturally appropriate to salvage artefacts from certain sites; and Aboriginal Site Impact Recording Forms are to be completed (and submitted to the OEH) for each Aboriginal object / locale harmed during construction of the Project. | | | | | |
| Traff | ic and Transport | | | | | | | |
| 021 | Safety and asset protection | Minimise risk | Contract a licensed haulage contractor with experience in transporting heavy and over-size loads, to be responsible for obtaining all required approvals and permits from the RMS and Councils and for complying with any conditions specified in the aforementioned approvals. The contractor is required to be cognisant of the proposed route upgrades outlined in section 12.4.2 of the EIS and Appendix 14 and the commitment made within Table 5 of the Amended DA , with appropriate upgrades and mitigation measures to be agreed in consultation with the relevant authorities during detailed design. | Proponent in consultation with contractor, RMS and Councils | V | | | |
| 022 | Safety and asset protection | Minimise risk | An EMS sub-plan will be developed, to include, but not be limited to: Scheduling of deliveries, timing of transport, limiting the number of trips per day, and reducing traffic during school bus route hours, i.e., 7.00 to 9.00 am and 3.00 to 4.30 pm; Undertaking community consultation before and during all haulage activities and providing a dedicated telephone contact list to enable any issues to be rapidly identified and addressed; Letterbox drop along affected routes; Minimise disruption to local vehicles by ensuring average and maximum wait times due to Project related traffic along local roads are kept to a minimum (typically an average maximum of 3 minutes wait time); Managing the haulage process, including temporary, short term road closures, the erection of warning signs and / or advisory speed signs | Proponent in consultation with licensed haulage contractor and road authorities | V | ~ | | ✓ |

Objective

Impact

| | Deeneneihilitu | | St | age | |
|---|----------------|----|----|-----|----|
| Mitigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| posted in advance of isolated curves, crests, narrow bridges and | | | | | |
| changes of road conditions; | | | | | |
| Designing and implementing temporary modifications to | | | | | |
| intersections and roadside furniture as appropriate; | | | | | |
| • Assessing, designing and implementing potential alignment changes | | | | | |
| to the existing road and culverts; | | | | | |
| Producing a Transport Code of Conduct which would be made | | | | | |
| available to all contractors and staff detailing traffic routes, | | | | | |
| behavioural requirements and speed limits; | | | | | |
| Establishing procedures to monitor traffic impacts on public and | | | | | |
| internal access tracks during construction, including noise, erosion, | | | | | |
| sediment, dust nuisance and travel times, and to implement modified | | | | | |
| work methods to reduce such impacts where practicable; | | | | | |
| Where reconstruction or provision of a temporary crossing is | | | | | |
| required over a creek or drainage structure, the design of this | | | | | |
| structure will be discussed with the relevant authority; and | | | | | |
| Reinstating pre-existing conditions after temporary modifications to | | | | | |
| the roads and pavements along the route, where applicable, in | | | | | |
| consultation with relevant authorities. | | | | | |
| An EMS sub-plan will be developed to minimise and manage impacts on | Proponent in | | | | |
| least use all set of for structure in the least to should be | | | | | |

| 023 | Safety and asset protection | Minimise risk | An EMS sub-plan will be developed to minimise and manage impacts on local roads and infrastructure, which shall include: | Proponent in consultation with | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | Prepare road dilapidation reports covering pavement, drainage and bridge structures, in consultation with RMS and the local Councils, where relevant, for all of the proposed transport routes before and after the relevant stage of construction. Develop a program of inspection regimes in consultation with the local Councils. Damage resulting from construction traffic, except that resulting from normal wear and tear, would be repaired at the Proponent's cost. Alternatively, the Proponent may negotiate other forms of compensation for road damage with the relevant road authorities, as | Council and road authorities | ¥ | ✓ | ~ |
| | | | | | | | |

| | luna a at | Objective | Mikigation Magazura | Deenensihility | | Sta | age | |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|--|--|----|-----|-----|----|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| 024 | Safety and asset protection | Minimise risk | Consideration for establishing a transport pool for employees from nearby towns to minimise traffic volumes. | Proponent | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 025 | Safety and asset protection | Minimise risk | Establish a procedure to ensure the ongoing maintenance of the Project site internal access roads during the operation phase. This maintenance would include sedimentation and erosion control structures, where necessary. | Proponent | | | V | |
| 026 | Safety and asset protection | Minimise risk | Prior to decommissioning, prepare and implement an EMS sub-plan reflecting change in traffic operation and volume in future years. | Proponent in consultation with Council and road authorities | | | | ~ |
| Aviat | Aviation Assessment | | | | | | | |
| 027 | Creation of hazard | Minimise risk | The Proponent will provide the RAAF AIS, CASA, AsA, AAAA, RFDS and NSW RFS with the final wind turbine and monitoring mast locations and dimensions prior to construction. After construction is complete, the Proponent will provide RAAF AIS, CASA, AsA, AAAA, RFDS and NSW RFS with the "as constructed" details. | Proponent | ✓ | ✓ | ~ | |
| 028 | Creation of hazard | Minimise risk | The Proponent will provide CASA with notification of any cranes (temporary obstacles) that exceed 110 m above ground level. | Proponent | ~ | √ | | ✓ |
| 029 | Creation of hazard | Minimise risk | Appropriate information regarding the wind turbine layout and dimensions, including monitoring masts will be supplied to the NSW RFS, if required, to assist in their planning and execution of airborne fire response. | Proponent | √ | ~ | 1 | √ |
| 030 | Creation of hazard | Minimise risk | On receipt of Development Consent for the Project, and with particular regard to the Aeronautical Impact Assessment and Obstacle Lighting | Proponent in consultation with CASA | ✓ | | | |

| | Import | Objective | Mitigation Massura | Bosnonsihility | | St | age | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|----|----|-----|--------------|
| | impact | Objective | | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD |
| | | | Review, the Proponent will consult with CASA on the issue of obstacle lighting. | | | | | |
| Com | munication | | | | | | | |
| 031 | Deterioration of signal strength | Minimise deterioration | Where practicable, use equipment complying with appropriate Electromagnetic Emission Standards. | Proponent | ~ | √ | | \checkmark |
| 032 | Deterioration of signal strength | Minimise deterioration | Establish a system for recording any complaints on interference, to allow for further investigations with the affected party, and to reach an amicable solution. | Proponent | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 033 | Deterioration of signal strength | Minimise deterioration | General mitigation methods for radio-communication, if impacts occur, may include: | Proponent | | | | |
| | | | Modifications to or relocation of existing antennae; Installation of a directional antennae; and Installation of an amplifier to boost the signal. | | | | V | • |
| 034 | Deterioration of signal strength | Minimise deterioration | If television interference is experienced and reported by an existing receiver in the vicinity of the Project, the source and nature of the interference would be investigated by the Proponent. Should the cause of interference be attributed to the Project, then the Proponent will put suitable mitigation measures in place after consultation and agreement with the affected landowner or television broadcaster. These could include: Replacement / re-orientation of existing aerials to an alternative transmitter; Provision of a land line between the affected receiver and an antenna located in a suitable reception area; Provision of satellite (including new VAST Satellite TV service); and Installation of a new repeater station in a location where | Proponent | | | • | ✓ |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Maasura | Pocnoncibility | | St | age | |
|--------|--|----------------------|--|--|----|----|-----|----|
| | impact | Objective | | Responsibility | РС | С | ОМ | RD |
| Elect | romagnetic Fields | | | | | | | |
| 035 | Exposure to EMFs | Minimise exposure | Bury electrical cables where feasible to shield electrical fields. | Proponent | | √ | | ✓ |
| 036 | Exposure to EMFs | Minimise exposure | Place appropriate security fencing around emitting structures (e.g. collector substation and switching station sites). | Proponent | ✓ | | | |
| 037 | Exposure to EMFs | Minimise exposure | Ensure the public, including tourists, that need to go near emitting structures are accompanied by a trained and qualified staff member. | Proponent | | | ~ | ✓ |
| Fire a | and Bushfire | | | | | | | |
| 038 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Adherence to all regulations under the <i>NSW Rural Fires Act 1997</i> and the Southern Tablelands and South West Slopes Bushfire Risk Management Plans. | Proponent in consultation with relevant authorities | V | ~ | ✓ | √ |
| 039 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Prepare an Emergency Response Plan in accordance with the ' <i>Guide to Developing a bushfire Evacuation Plan'</i> (NSW RFS 2004) and the AS 3745:2010 ' <i>Planning for Emergencies in Facilities</i> ' | Proponent in consultation with NSW RFS and NSW Fire Brigade | √ | | | |
| 040 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | The NSW RFS and NSW Fire Brigade will be consulted regarding the adequacy of bushfire prevention measures to be implemented on-site during pre-construction, construction, operation and decommissioning. These measures will potentially cover hot-work procedures, asset protection zones (APZs), safety, communication, site access and response protocols in the event of a fire originating in the Project infrastructure, or in the event of an external bushfire threatening the Project or nearby properties. | Proponent in consultation with RFS and NSW Fire Brigade | V | ~ | ✓ | V |

| | luce use at | Ohiostivo | Daising Managemen | Deenensihilitu | | St | age | je | | |
|-----|--|---------------|---|--|----|----|-----|----|--|--|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD | | |
| 041 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Provide NSW RFS with the locations of individual wind turbines, wind monitoring masts, ancillary infrastructure, construction work schedule, location of additional water supplies for construction, potential landing pads for firefighting aircraft and helicopters and access gates for firefighting services. | Proponent | V | • | ~ | ✓ | | |
| 042 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Installation of access tracks of appropriate width and vertical clearances with access suitable for all weather conditions. | Proponent | ~ | ~ | | ~ | | |
| 043 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Construction and maintenance staff trained in the basic first response firefighting techniques. | Proponent in consultation with NSW RFS and NSW Fire Brigade | | ~ | | ~ | | |
| 044 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Provide and maintain firefighting equipment capable of controlling and suppressing small initial outbreaks of fire. | Proponent | | ~ | | ✓ | | |
| 045 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Maintain provision for mobile telephone and UHF radio communications. | Proponent in consultation with NSW RFS and NSW Fire Brigade | | ~ | | ~ | | |
| 046 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | The collector substations will be bunded with a capacity exceeding the volume of the transformer oil. The facility will be regularly inspected and maintained to ensure leaks do not present a fire hazard, and to ensure the bunded area is clear (including the removal of any rainwater). | Proponent | V | ~ | √ | ~ | | |
| 047 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Placement and maintenance of APZ around project infrastructure where appropriate to minimise the spread of fire, to include: | Proponent | ✓ | ✓ | √ | ✓ | | |

| | luce use and | Ohiostius | | Deenensihilitu | | Sta | tage | | |
|-----|--|---------------|---|--|----|-----|------|----|--|
| | Impact | Objective | Witigation Measure | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD | |
| | | | Maintain fuel reduced zones for all overhead transmission lines in consultation with TransGrid and / or Essential Energy; Surround collector substations with a gravel and concrete area, free of vegetation; Maintain a reduced fuel zone (APZ or defendable space) around each turbine to ensure adequate defendable space in accordance with the performance criteria and acceptable solutions of PBP 2006; Maintain a fuel reduced zones around construction activities that may result in ignition of a fire, i.e. welding; and Ignition creating activities such as welding not to be undertaken outside on days of total fire ban. | | | | | | |
| 048 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Wind turbines will be shut down if monitored components reach critical temperatures or if directed to by the NSW RFS in the case of a nearby bushfire being declared (an all-hours contact number would be available to the NSW RFS during the bushfire period). | Proponent in consultation with the RFS | | | ~ | | |
| 049 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Flammable materials and ignition sources brought onto the Project site will be handled and stored as per manufacturer's instructions. | Proponent | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 050 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Lightning protection will be installed correctly and maintained to minimise risk of malfunction. | Proponent | | ~ | | ✓ | |
| 051 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Total fire ban days will be considered in regard to hours within which construction takes place, minimising the risk of fire and bushfire ignition. | Proponent | | ~ | | ✓ | |
| 052 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Undertake regular inspections of overhead transmission lines to ensure they are not fouled by branches. | Proponent | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Pocnoncibility | | Stage | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|----|-------|----|----|--|--|
| | | | | Responsibility | PC | С | ОМ | RD | | |
| 053 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | Where appropriate, ensure adequate access to water for NSW RFS and firefighting crews as detailed in the Bushfire Management and Emergency Response Plan. | Proponent in consultation with the NSW RFS | | ✓ | √ | √ | | |
| 054 | Increase risk of fire ignition or spread | Minimise risk | All site vehicles to have diesel engines and to use the site access roads to minimise the likelihood of igniting dry grass. | Proponent | | ~ | √ | √ | | |
| Wate | er | | | | | | | | | |
| 055 | Loss of integrity to riparian corridor | Minimise loss | Works and disturbances not identified as part of the Development Footprint within the Amended DA (with the exception of crossings) should not be located in any riparian corridors. | Proponent in consultation with NOW | √ | ~ | | √ | | |
| 056 | Loss of integrity to riparian corridor | Minimise loss | NOW guidelines for river crossing designs, based on the Strahler Stream Order Categorisation to minimise environmental impact, will be followed in the design and upgrade of existing roads and river crossings. | Proponent in consultation with NOW | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| 057 | Impact on watercourses | Minimise impact | All waterway crossings are to undergo detailed assessment and design post-approval, and are to be constructed in consultation with NOW and DPI (Fisheries) and in line with the NOW <i>Guidelines for Controlled</i> <i>Activities</i> and DPI (Fisheries) guidelines: <i>Policy and Guidelines for Fish</i> <i>Friendly Waterway Crossings</i> (2004) and <i>Why do Fish Need to Cross the</i> <i>Road</i> (2004). | Proponent in consultation with NOW and DPI (Fishing and Aquaculture) | ~ | ~ | | | | |
| 058 | Impact on watercourses | Minimise Impact | All required watercourse crossings will be designed to protect and enhance water flow, water quality, stream ecology and existing riparian vegetation. | Proponent in consultation with NOW | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| 059 | Loss of water quality and change to hydraulic regime | Minimise loss and impact on adjacent watercourses | An EMS sub-plan will be developed to ensure soil disturbance and erosion from surface runoff is minimised and in order to minimise disturbance to water resources and riparian zones in the area. This sub-plan will include: | Proponent in consultation with NOW and in | √ | ~ | ✓ | ~ | | |

| | luces a st | Ohiostius | Daiking Maggaung | Deeneneihilitu | | Stage | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|---|----|-------|----|----|--|--|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Measure | Responsibility | РС | С | ОМ | RD | | |
| | | | Construction and operation of the Project to comply with Section 120 of the Protection of the Environment Operations (POEO) Act 1997; Project design and construction to not worsen existing flooding characteristics in the vicinity of the Project; Monitoring of low- and high- flow conditions is to be regularly undertaken prior to the commencement of works to determine baseline water quality parameters. Surface water monitoring locations should include: Junction of Dirt Hole Creek and Bank Creek; Junction of Dirt Hole Creek and Bank Creek; Junction of Dry Creek and Langs Creek; Upper reaches of Fat Jack Creek; Upper reaches of Gorham Creek; Upper reaches of Kangiara Creek; and Upper reaches of Thorsby Creek. All ancillary drainage infrastructure, e.g., sediment and litter traps are to, where practicable, be located outside the riparian corridor. Runoff is to be of an appropriate water quality and quantity before discharge into a riparian corridor or watercourse; All stockpiles are to be located away from drainage lines and natural watercourses, road surfaces and trees and, where necessary, are to be appropriately protected to contain sediment and runoff (e.g. sediment fencing); Regular inspection, maintenance and cleaning of water quality and sedimentation control devices; and Due regard for the Lachlan (Kalare) CAP in the preparation of the EMS. | reference to Landcom 2004 | | | | | | |
| 060 | Loss of water quality and change to hydraulic regime | Minimise loss and impact on adjacent watercourses | Mitigate for any impacts on groundwater as a result of the construction or operation of the Project, including contamination and impacts on flow rates. Ensure that there are no lasting impacts on groundwater following decommissioning. | Proponent in consultation with Landcom 2004 | | ✓ | ~ | √ | | |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Posponsibility | Sta | | age | |
|-------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|------|----|-----|---|
| | inipact | Objective | Witigation Measure | Responsibility | PC C | ОМ | RD | |
| 061 | Loss of water quality and change to hydraulic regime | Minimise impact on groundwater | Carry out a groundwater investigation prior to any blasting on-site (if required) to ensure that there is no adverse impact on groundwater for users or dependent ecosystems. If the investigation highlights areas of concern, then appropriate mitigation or alternative methods will be used. | Proponent in consultation with NOW | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| 062 | Supply of water for construction | Obtain water for construction | Calculate all necessary water demands once final Development Footprint has been determined. Identify water requirements, including the locality of proposed works, extraction points, times, volumes and rates. Secure the necessary water licensing permits required at the time of extraction. | Proponent in consultation with NOW | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| 063 | Supply of water for construction | Obtain water for construction | Should the on or near-site provision of water be insufficient, water will be sourced from commercial suppliers as required. | Proponent | ✓ | √ | | |
| Air Q | uality | | | | | | | |
| 064 | Deterioration of air quality | Minimise impact | An EMS sub-plan will be developed to minimise and manage impacts on air quality which shall include: | Proponent | | | | |
| | | | The identification of potential sources of dust; Dust management objectives; Mitigations measures to be implemented, including measures during weather conditions where high level dust episodes are probable; A monitoring program to assess compliance with identified objectives; and Mechanisms for the monitoring, review and amendment of this plan. | | ~ | ~ | | ~ |
| 065 | Deterioration of air quality | Minimise impact | During excavation topsoil will be stockpiled. After excavation topsoil will be replaced for seeding and excess subsoil will be disposed of in an appropriate manner. If any excavation occurs on steep slopes the topsoil may need to be stabilised. | Proponent | | ~ | | V |
| 066 | Deterioration of air quality | Minimise impact | Where practicable, stockpiled material will be covered with plastic, seeded or otherwise bound to reduce dust. Dust levels at stockpile sites | Proponent | | ✓ | | ~ |

| | lueu e et | Ohiaatiwa | Mitigation Massure | Deenensihilitu | Sta | | age | |
|--------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|-----|---|-----|----|
| | impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Responsibility | РС | С | ОМ | RD |
| | | | are to be visually monitored. Dust suppression (e.g. water sprays) will be implemented if required. | | | | | |
| 067 | Deterioration of air quality | Minimise impact | During dry and windy conditions a water cart or alternative (non- chemical) dust suppression would be available and applied to work areas. | Proponent | | √ | | ✓ |
| 068 | Deterioration of air quality | Minimise impact | If blasting is required, appropriate guidelines for control of blasting impacts will be followed. (i.e. Australian New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council). | Proponent in consultation with ANZECC | | ~ | | √ |
| Soil a | nd Landforms | | | | | | | |
| 069 | Disturbance to soil and water | Minimise disturbance | Soil and water management measures consistent with Landcom (2004) to be employed during construction to minimise soil erosion and the discharge of sediment and other pollutants to land and / or water. | Proponent in reference to Landcom 2004 | ✓ | ~ | | |
| 070 | Disturbance to existing land | Minimise disturbance | An EMS sub-plan will be developed to provide specific measures for soil, including: | Proponent | | | | |
| | formations | | Procedures for personnel to manage suspected contaminated soils disturbed during earthworks; All disturbed soil surfaces to be stabilised as soon as practicable after works have ceased in the area; All stockpiles to be covered where practicable to minimise the loss of material during high wind and rain events. Where practicable, stockpiles to be placed in areas sheltered from the wind; Planning for erosion and sediment control concurrently with engineering design, prior to any works commencing; Progressive rehabilitation of disturbed land as soon as practicable; Jute matting or similar to be used to stabilise the soil and minimise weed invasion; and Implementation of management measures to minimise sediment and runoff entering watercourses. | | V | ¥ | | ~ |

| Impact | | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Posponsibility | | Stage | | | | |
|--------|------------------|---|--|---|----|-------|----|----|--|--|
| | impact | Objective | | Responsibility | РС | С | ОМ | RD | | |
| 071 | Soil compaction | Minimise impact | An EMS sub-plan will be developed which will have specific measures for stock management: Removal of stock access from construction areas for entire construction periods to allow for regeneration – subject to landowner participation; and Before remediation works, grazing to be removed where practicable, and subject to landowner participation and the grass sward allowed time to recover and minimise areas of bare soil. | Proponent in consultation with associated landowners | | ✓ | | V | | |
| Wast | e | | | | | | | | | |
| 072 | Waste generation | Minimise waste and maximise recycling | Provide skip bins and recycling bins on-site to handle packaging materials and domestic waste. | Proponent | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| 073 | Waste generation | Minimise waste and maximise recycling | Mulch vegetation and use on-site where feasible, otherwise burn on-site with permission from Council, provide firewood to landowners or take to the Boorowa Garbage Depot operated by Boorowa Council or Murrumbateman Transfer Station / Landfill operated by Yass Valley Council. | Proponent | | ✓ | | √ | | |
| 074 | Waste generation | Appropriate disposal of waste | On-site toilets will either be drained by a septic tank or be an enclosed unit. | Proponent | | ✓ | ~ | ~ | | |
| 075 | Waste generation | Appropriate disposal of waste | All chemicals and oils will be treated as contaminated waste at the Boorowa Garbage Depot, the Murrumbateman Transfer Station / Landfill or via ChemClear. | Proponent | | ✓ | ✓ | √ | | |
| 076 | Waste generation | Appropriate disposal of waste | Any disposal of unsuitable excavated material will require approval from local Council. | Proponent | | √ | | ~ | | |

Crown Roads and Trigonometrical Stations

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Posponsibility | ility | | Stage | | |
|------|--|--|---|---|-------|---|-------|----|--|
| | inipact | inpact Objective | | Responsibility | РС | С | ОМ | RD | |
| 077 | Damage to Trigonometrical Stations | Avoid damage | Commitment to avoid disturbing and damaging the Trigonometrical Stations and adjacent witness marks. | Proponent | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| 078 | Crown roads | Liaise with the DPI (Catchments and Lands (CaL)) | Relevant permits will be sought from CaL where Project infrastructure impacts upon Crown Roads. | Proponent in consultation with CaL | ~ | ~ | | ~ | |
| Cons | truction | | | | | | | | |
| 079 | Environmental | Minimise impact | Micro-site Project infrastructure with respect to the Study Area and Development Footprint assessed within the Amended DA, whilst minimising impacts to non-involved residences and ecologically sensitive habitats and species. | Proponent in consultation with DPE | ~ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| 080 | Environmental | Minimise impact | On-site environmental representative to be granted authorisations to permit minor modifications to the project design with general regard to the Amended DA following detailed design activities. | Proponent | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| 081 | Decommissioning | Manage process | A Decommissioning and Rehabilitation Plan (DRP) will be prepared during the pre-decommissioning phase, towards the end of the Project's life. The DRP will detail the process of decommissioning, including addressing whether components are to be removed or left in situ. All decommissioning work will be the responsibility of the Project owner, which is a provision within the lease arrangements with relevant landowners. | Proponent in consultation with Landowners | | | | ✓ | |
| Mine | ral Exploration | | | | | | | | |

| | Impact | Objective | Mitigation Measure | Posponsibility | hility | | age | |
|------|---|---|--|---|--------|---|-----|----|
| | impact | Objective | Witigation Weasure | P | РС | С | ОМ | RD |
| 082 | Future land use for mineral exploration | Minimise impact | Liaise with relevant mining companies and provide updates of any modifications to the Project design that arise during the construction of the Project. | Proponent | | ✓ | | |
| 083 | Future land use for mineral exploration | Minimise impact | At the time of decommissioning, communicate with associated landowners and mineral title holders that may wish to retain roads. | Proponent | | | | ✓ |
| Com | munity Wellbeing | | | | | | | |
| 084 | Effect on local area | Maximise positive effect of proposal | A contribution of \$2,825 per installed wind turbine annually into a Community Fund as each stage of the Project commences commercial operation. This fund will be established in close cooperation with Yass Valley and Boorowa Councils with decisions on how funds are to be allocated determined by a committee made up of representatives from the local community, Council and the Proponent. | Proponent in consultations with Councils and community | * | | ~ | ~ |
| Econ | omic | | | | | | | |
| 085 | Effect on local area | Maximise positive effect of proposal | Local contractors will be used where feasible, which will allow the Proponent to utilise the full potential of local resources. | Proponent in consultation with local industry reps | ✓ | √ | | ✓ |
| | | | | | | | | |

8. Conclusion

This Amended DA has evaluated the reduced environmental impacts that may result from the proposed amendments to the Bango Wind Farm, a revised proposal incorporating up to 75 wind turbines.

The Project remains consistent with the State's priorities to secure a reliable electricity supply with an increased renewable energy component, and contributes significantly to the achievement of the State's renewable energy target. The Project will also play an important role in contributing to both the increasing local and global need for such renewable projects to tackle the issues of Global Warming and Climate Change; contributing additional renewable energy generation to meet the legislated Australian target.

The Project has been assessed in accordance with the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* and has taken into consideration the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*, along with other Federal, State and Local Government legislation, policy and guidelines. The scope of the assessment covered the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements, the requirements of other State and Federal agencies, and consideration of the wellbeing of community stakeholders. The Environmental Impact Statement process, including responses received and responded to arising from public exhibition, entailed consultation with a wide range of Project stakeholders. Specialists were also engaged to provide independent predictive modelling and impact assessment expertise in key environmental and technical areas.

The operation of the Project would entail environmental and social impacts, in particular the introduction of visually prominent structures on the rural landscape of the Project site, and some loss to the agricultural production of land which will be occupied by wind farm infrastructure. As part of the iterative process of project development, the Project layouts and siting of associated infrastructure have been optimised to avoid areas of environmental and cultural significance, minimise disruption to agricultural production, and reduce as much as possible visual, noise and amenity impacts on the local community. The same environmental and sustainability objectives will continue to be significant considerations in the final choice of model and micro-siting of the wind turbines.

The EIS and Amended DA demonstrate the suitability of the site as the potential impacts of the Project could be avoided or mitigated to reduce any residual environmental risks to low levels. The Statement of Commitments within the Amended DA detail all environmental aspects related to the Project which should be used to inform Development Consent Conditions of Approval. The Proponent is committed to ensuring the measures proposed in developing the Project are best practice, and that they maintain the high standard set in all regions within which CWP Renewables operate.

The Project is in the public interest as it would deliver a sustainable source of energy with minimal environmental and social impact to the Project Site and region, addressing climate change, improving the resilience of our energy supply and delivering local and regional jobs and economic stimulus. The environmental performance of the Project will be continually monitored so that the positive environmental and social outcomes are achieved and maintained. The existing land use within the project site will continue concurrent with the operation of the wind farm, thereby maintaining the Project Site's agricultural production capacity. Aside from the reduction in greenhouse gases, opportunities to offset residual loss of native vegetation and habitat through the protection and enhancement of existing habitat will help achieve a net environmental benefit from the Project.

It is therefore considered that the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed Bango Wind Farm is justified on the basis of the environmental benefits it will bring, even as the range of mitigation measures identified in this Amended DA minimises its potential environmental impacts.

Appendix A – A3-Sized Project Maps

- A1 Layout 1 Project Overview Map
- A2 Layout 1 Project Overview Constraints Map
- A3 Layout 2 Project Overview Map
- A4 Layout 2 Project Overview Constraints Map
- A5 Photomontages
- A6 Wireframe images

Appendix B - Consultant Reports & Correspondence

- B1 iCubed preliminary designs for Main Entrance
- B2 ERM Biodiversity Response to Submissions
- B3 Sonus Noise Impact Assessment Report
- B4 Green Bean Updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- B5 Correspondence with Councils regarding roads
- B6 Aviation Impact Assessment Report
- B7 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Summary