



---

HILLS OF GOLD PRESERVATION INC.  
87 JENKINS STREET NUNDLE NSW 2340

Mr Andrew Dyer  
Australian Energy Infrastructure Commissioner

Monday, September 19th, 2023

Dear Andrew,

**RE: Community Engagement Review by Australian Energy Infrastructure Commissioner**

Thank you for the opportunity for Hills of Gold Preservation Inc members to make a submission to the federal government Community Engagement Review.

Our members were grateful for the opportunity to meet with you and your team in Tamworth as part of the consultation process.

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc recently held its fifth Annual General Meeting after forming in 2018 to represent landowners consulting with all levels of government and developers regarding proposed Hills of Gold Wind Farm.

We appreciate the federal government's effort to better understand what best practice engagement looks like, and how elements of the renewables industry are falling short.

We have answered the key questions posed by the Community Engagement Review Discussion Paper.

**• What community engagement has worked well and what can we learn from it?**

*Landowners helping landowners*

The bush telegraph is alive and well across rural Australia and when rural people see others struggling they reach out to help. This has seen the emergence of landowner advocacy groups at a local, regional and national level. The landowner protests at recent Bush Summits held across Australia are evidence of the capacity of landowners to band together to advocate for property rights and the protection of high value agricultural and environmental land. A Hills of Gold Preservation Inc representative was among landowners who met with Prime Minister Anthony Albanese at the Bush Summit at Tamworth. We

appreciate that the federal government is listening and attempting to improve the experience of rural communities.

#### *Community Consultative Committee*

Participation in the Hills of Gold Wind Farm Community Consultative Committee was incredibly stressful and required days of research in preparation for the 11 meetings between June 2019 and October 2022. The CCC has since been disbanded however the CCC minutes are available online as a public record

<https://engie.com.au/community-consultative-committee-ccc>

The CCC minutes show that it doesn't matter whether a developer engages with a community early or often, it is the quality of the engagement that matters. How is quality engagement measured? Let's start with transparency, honesty, accountability, and respect for local community values.

It is distressing that other NSW communities will not have the opportunity to participate in CCCs until project approval. It is only by participating in the CCC that our community was able to ask for detailed information, and were able to ask questions of the developer. As an example, CCC members repeatedly asked the developer if the proposal was being sold, after media reports of a new owner. The new owner was eventually announced, months after the question was first asked at a CCC.

Participation in the CCC demonstrated that the developer did not have the local microknowledge of the proposed site to understand the community's values or the extent of potential impacts. Whole communities south and west of the proposal would have been left out of the EIS and engagement process if CCC members hadn't pointed out they had been ignored.

#### *Public Meetings*

The renewables industry has known tactics for managing community outrage, specifically keeping conversations one-on-one. However, our community has benefited greatly from public meetings held in Nundle Memorial Hall to share information and ask questions. Wind Energy Partners Pty Ltd and DPE have held one public meeting each since 2018. Nundle Business Tourism and Marketing Group Inc and Hills of Gold Preservation Inc have also organised public meetings to share information. In a community deeply divided by a wind energy generation proposal, public meetings are an important opportunity to expose opposing sides to each other's questions and answers.

#### *Regional Forums*

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc members have attended several meetings hosted by the NSW Farmers Association, Department of Planning and Environment, Energy Co, and Uralla Shire Council at Armidale, Uralla, Walcha and Tamworth.

It is by attending these forums that members have gained a better understanding of the national and state renewable energy targets, and renewables transmission and generation planned for the broader region and state.

#### Digital Communication

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc members receive digital communication from AEMO, Energy Co, and DPE. The communication takes the form of newsletters, website links and webinars. It is an essential way to be informed of strategic planning reports to understand what is in the pipeline at a national, state and local level. Digital communication complements face to face regional forums.

#### *NSW Farmers' Association Energy Working Group*

We are aware of the research by the NSW Farmers Association Energy Working Group and are impressed with the suggestions they have presented regarding siting renewables and transmission lines on marginal country, in far western NSW. These larger landholdings are more likely able to absorb the impacts and benefits of renewables instead of imposing the impacts on Non-Associated Dwellings. The working group also advocates siting renewables on already industrialised mining land, or industrial rooftops.

#### *Australian Energy Infrastructure Commissioner*

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc has met with Andrew Dyer in person, phone and video conference several times since 2019. We appreciate Andrew's knowledge of the renewables sector, the assessment process and appreciation of country values. It has been helpful to read Andrew's annual reports to gain an understanding of the national experience of renewables developments. Andrew's team is extremely helpful and professional.

#### DPE Planner

We have been fortunate to have a very responsive DPE planner. Our members are grateful that calls and emails are responded to in a timely and respectful manner. The DPE Planner assigned to a renewables proposal is a frontline position and needs to be well resourced to ensure the best community engagement possible. When communities first become aware of a renewables proposal in their local area there is a scramble for information. The DPE is usually one of the first points of contact for communities aiming to understand the assessment process. In our experience it wasn't easy to find resources that explained the assessment process and relevant Visual and Noise assessment guidelines. When Hills of Gold Preservation Inc started interacting with the initial developer, they published an incorrect assessment flowchart on their website. We had to ask for the developer to replace it.

#### **Recommendations**

- Reinstall Community Consultative Committees to enable communities to ask questions of developers in formal, minuted meetings.
- Host public meetings in non-associated public venues, to bring communities together to exchange questions and answers.
- Continue to partner with rural and regional advocacy networks including NSW Farmers' Association, that represent country people and understand their values.
- Continue digital communication with rural stakeholders to overcome distance and isolation.
- Continue to fund the office of the AEIC.

- Create a page on the DPE Website for Communities Experiencing Renewables Proposals with a one-stop-reference featuring an assessment flow chart, and relevant guidelines.

## • How we can improve engagement that has not worked well?

### *No social licence*

Hills of Gold Wind Farm has been contentious since it was first made public in Q1 2018. A principal reason why the proposal is contentious is that it is not welcomed by the local majority of residents.

Our community was not asked whether it accepted a wind farm being proposed on the range between Nundle, Hanging Rock and Timor. The proposal was imposed on our community.

The developer is a door to door salesperson and the local majority do not want to buy what they are offering. No quality or quantity of community engagement will change that position.

No amount of bribery in the form of community benefit funds, neighbour agreements, sponsorship, or payments to local councils can compensate for loss of amenity or environmental impacts. Our members do not want to touch the developer's money and will not be associated with community groups that do, or assets purchased with developer funds.

Our amenity and environment cannot be replaced elsewhere. There is no other Nundle, Hanging Rock, Crawney or Timor.

When Hills of Gold Preservation Inc provided evidence of lack of social licence for Hills of Gold Wind Farm the developer ignored it and continued to claim this was a "vocal minority" and that there was majority local support for the proposal in its EIS, EIS Amendments, and media including website, newsletters, editorial, and advertising. To add salt to the wound the developer's representatives claimed that members of the community opposing the proposal were uneducated, a claim that has no basis.

This experience has further eroded social licence for the proposal and resulted in lack of respect for the developer and process. There is no recovery once social licence for a proposal is lost.

### *Social Division*

Social division associated with lack of social licence is crippling rural communities. Once cooperative volunteer committees have broken apart, events have been cancelled and business owners have lost motivation to invest in or expand their enterprises. The Good Will necessary to power volunteering and events has eroded. Cooperation in rural communities is also essential for firefighting and responding to natural disasters such as flood, snow and storms.

Our community has been severely damaged by the Hills of Gold Wind Farm proposal. Nearly six years after it was made public, there are community members who do not talk to each other, will not work on committees together, and will cross the street to avoid each other.

Landowners opposing the proposal have been threatened with legal action by a potential turbine host and the developer has outlined pathways for legal action. The prospect of future legal action regarding the proposed renewables project is a further barrier to healing of the community.

The loss of social capital in rural communities is an unaccounted cost of renewables and it will not be recovered for a generation at least, maybe more.

#### *Public Relations consultancy*

Renewables companies are employing public relations consultancies to manage community outrage regarding renewables. Engie has utilised billboard, newspaper, and radio advertising, editorial, newsletters, and its website to attempt to change local community perception of Hills of Gold Wind Farm. The lack of social licence associated with Hills of Gold Wind Farm cannot be overturned by marketing communications. Country people can see through marketing to understand a company is attempting to buy their support. If a proposal is fundamentally flawed, nothing can change that.

#### *Sponsorship*

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc has complained twice about Engie's two rounds of sponsorship during the DPE Assessment. The wind farm is so divisive in our community that many community groups decided against applying for sponsorship. Engie has used recipients of its sponsorship to project an image of support for Hills of Gold Wind Farm in advertising and editorial. Sponsorship is marketing.

#### *David vs Goliath*

Where there is conflict regarding a renewables proposal it is sometimes projected as a David versus Goliath battle. That is certainly what it feels like on the ground. Local community members are volunteers with limited financial resources. Their assets are their microknowledge and lived experience. Offshore companies have access to large budgets for marketing, legal challenges, and staff. They have ease of geographic access to DPE staff for meetings. So yes, it is an unmatched battle and an unacceptable burden on rural communities, breeding resentment for renewables and REZes.

#### *Misleading information*

At a meeting between the Hills of Gold Wind Farm developers' representatives and six community leaders in February 2018, community members present were told, "If the community doesn't want it, it won't happen."

It didn't take long for us to realise that statement was not true. Ever since, there has been forward momentum through the DPE assessment process. The only way the progress of the proposal could be halted is withdrawal of the proposal by the developer.

The majority of the local community resents this intrusion in our lives and the extensive amount of time it has taken away from businesses, family, more enjoyable community service, and leisure. This is an expensive social opportunity cost that is not included in the cost of renewables proposals.

The renewables industry is known for its preference for communicating one-on-one, rather than with groups of residents. Before the Hills of Gold Wind Farm proposal was made public, the developer's representatives were meeting with residents closest to the proposal footprint one-on-one. From the get-go this secrecy makes landowners wary.

At the only public meeting hosted by the developer, incorrect information was presented to the community. Maps were presented proposing turbines on land owned by people who had not given their permission. Subsequently maps were published proposing transmission lines on landowners property without their permission. No maps should be published without the permission of relevant landowners because it presents an unrealistic projection of a proposal.

Inflated ongoing jobs figures were presented, and community members had to analyse ongoing jobs figures at other NSW wind farms to table at a Community Consultative Committee meeting. The developer's own socio-economic consultant estimated that local ongoing jobs would be less than five. This information was part of the thousands of pages of EIS documents and likely not read by people in the community who support the wind farm because of potential local jobs.

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc members have been appalled by the sloppiness, inconsistencies, omissions, and errors in consultants' reports and developers' EIS and Amendments. Offshore desktop studies, lack of local microknowledge, and poor understanding of the local ecosystem has meant our members have gone through thousands of pages of documents with a fine tooth comb to point out problems. Our members have crowdfunded independent peer reviews of Soil, Water, and Noise. To date we do not know whether the independent peer reviews have made any difference to the DPE Assessment Recommendation. Again, this is an unacceptable burden on rural communities and contributes to resentment of renewables and the assessment process.

Our members have experienced DPE technology that is not fit for purpose. During the EIS and EIS Amendments Public Exhibition the DPE online technology was not able to cope with the volume of submissions. In addition, the lack of computer access and computer literacy presented challenges for some members of the community to make a submission. To assist with the submission process Hills of Gold Preservation Inc created a pop-up office in the main street to help landowners with their submissions. During the EIS Amendments Public Exhibition, so many people experienced tech difficulties that some 50 submissions were mailed by Express Post the day before submissions closed. They arrived the morning after submissions closed and were not counted by the developer in their analysis. Meanwhile, the developer has received extension after extension to submit documents. The assessment process is inequitable and favours the developer.

### **Bogus Assessment?**

When HOGPI members first made contact with DPE representatives we were met with empathy and assured that there would be numerous opportunities for our concerns to be heard. We were told there would be a merit based assessment and the DPE would Recommend Approval or Rejection.

Nearly six years later, at times that empathy has been replaced with hostility and aloofness. At a NSW Farmers' Association and DPE forum at Armidale four years ago a senior DPE executive claimed that people living near wind turbines "get used to them." If this is the attitude at the top of the state government department assessing wind farms, then rural communities expecting fair and genuine assessment are in trouble. In the current political climate with pressure to address forecast gaps in NSW electricity supply, is Recommendation of Rejection even an option? If not, please stop the charade and be transparent with communities, that we are getting a wind farm regardless of access constraints, lack of social licence, or environmental consequences. Then we wouldn't waste thousands of hours of personal, and business time reading, researching and meeting, to stop the "proposal."

With the benefit of hindsight it appears that the DPE's role is to coach the developer towards Recommendation for Approval. This could explain the arrogance of developers throughout the assessment process. They don't have to do a good job because they are so confident their proposal will be approved.

If the DPE Assessment is an Approval process, be transparent. Then community members can make the decision to stay or leave.

Impacted landowners have provided feedback to our group on experiencing the following unacceptable behaviour:

- Lack of confidentiality ie information provided to the DPE being sent straight to the developer;
- Lack of independence ie developers are lodging money with the state government for an assessment and the DPE is providing them with extensions and advice rather than assessing the proposal on its merits;
- Inaccurate feedback and the inability to reject a project for all the reasons discussed;
- Lack of transparency with regard to the DPE assessment of clearly inaccurate or untruthful information;
- Lack of protection for communities and affected landowners and Australian taxpayers who are ultimately funding these projects;
- Misleading the Australian public by accepting projects that clearly have high social, environmental and food sustainability impacts (agriculture), yet have not been properly assessed or recognised;
- Not keeping multimillion dollar multinational companies accountable for environmental and social damage;
- Not having any clear strategies or processes in place to ensure the net benefit (ie environmental, financial and social) far outweighs the costs to ensure these projects



are not just money generating vehicles for international companies who can walk away at any stage.

- Inaccurate assessment of changes to fire fighting abilities endangering both communities and project infrastructure.
- Inaccurate assessment of all natural resources needed for development of the project.

This becomes a huge part of the social licence and the DPE are misleading all Australians by not having simple requirements in place:

1. Access to site
2. Social licence
3. A proponent that is financially liable and able to meet all requirements of the build and decommission of a project prior approval
4. Areas of high environmental, agricultural or cultural significance are preserved (i.e recognised no go zones).

These criteria need to be met prior to an EIS and need to be set as a measure against all projects currently under assessment and decommissioning and environmental protection regulations placed on all approved projects.

Our community is yet to be advised of the DPE Recommendation and has the prospect of an Independent Planning Commission Determination to endure. In a small community the IPC process has the potential to further deepen community division as community members present information publicly in person, writing, video conference or telephone. It will have additional mental health impacts for landowners in an already stressful, worsening forecast drought and economy.

#### *Inadequate Contracts*

Landowners have complained about the inadequacy of contracts presented to them proposing Neighbour Agreements.

Neighbour Benefit Sharing Agreements were marketed by the developer as “universal” contracts available to all members of the community within 5 kilometers of the project. The emphasis was on sharing the economic benefits of the project. Vague clauses required those who signed the agreements to accept all unspecified impacts of the neighbouring wind farm.

Some landowners obtained independent legal advice stating that they should not sign agreements because they did not provide detailed information, and threatened their property rights. Landowners have been distressed by developer tactics pressuring them to sign agreements when it is not transparent what they are signing.

A standard form of contracts, perhaps an “Impacted neighbour agreement”, should be introduced specifically for situations where adjoining landholders accept impacts to their property. Adequate information must accompany the contract, such as maps, photomontages and wire diagrams, property specific data for noise assessment, shadow flicker, blade glint, etc.



### *Environmental Impacts*

For the past five and a half years Hills of Gold Preservation Inc members have read thousands of pages of SEARS, EIS, EIS Amendments, CCC minutes and attachments, Response to Submissions, and Requests for Information.

During that time members have identified potential environmental impacts regarding transport of Oversize Overmass vehicles, soil mass movement, soil erosion and sedimentation, decreased water infiltration and storage, vegetation clearing, habitat loss, reduced biodiversity onsite and in neighbouring national parks, visual impact, agricultural and firefighting aerial restrictions, light pollution, and heritage.

During the period of Assessment the protected legal status of two species has been upgraded, but the developer's EIS and EIS Amendments and offsets do not reflect the upgraded legal status for the **Koala** now listed as **Endangered**.

The developer's offsets do not include potential indirect impacts to neighbouring **Ben Halls Gap Sphagnum Moss Cool Temperate Rainforest** that is now listed as **Critically Endangered** under the EPBC Act. Proposed mitigation is not detailed, nor considered an appropriate risk for an ecological community with such a small distribution in Australia.

There is still no engineering provided on mountaintop removal required for turbine foundations, hardstands, substation, O&M structure, switching station, and internal roads including a Transverse Track and Western Connector Road on steep slopes. If it is unknown how this infrastructure will be built, how can the environmental impact be assessed?

Our members have privately funded independent peer reviews of soil, water, and noise impacts. Regardless of the issues presented, the developer and Department of Planning and Environment approach to Avoid, Mitigate and Offset does not appear to leave room for Recommendation of Rejection to an Independent Planning Commission.

If that is the case, the community should not be given hope that by identifying concerns a proposal may be Recommended to be Rejected.

We are not aware of any renewables proposal that DPE has Recommended to be Rejected, a Determination upheld by an IPC and Land and Environment Court.

It is frustrating to experience the lack of accountability of state Members of Parliament, state ministers, and departmental staff who all say they are not the Consent Authority. It is the developer's financial capacity to pursue a proposal in court that becomes the Consent Authority.

NSW rural communities are watching the Hills of Gold Wind Energy proposal Recommendation and Determination to see if DPE assessment is genuine, or an approval process where water, soil, native forests, groundcover, native fauna and landowner amenity are sacrificed to avoid projected firming capacity gaps.

The proponent's proposed community enhancement fund, construction payment to council, and sponsorship program are no compensation. Biodiversity Stewardship Agreements and Biodiversity Offset Credits do not replace biodiversity loss. This is not a just or honest transition.

The Hills of Gold Wind Energy proposal should not be forced on the local community that would have to witness and live with the environmental consequences.

#### *Local Government*

Even larger local councils are not adequately resourced to research, assess and respond to renewables developers' EIS documents, especially if they are exhibited twice! Some local councils have multiple renewables developments in their LGAs and are dealing with the cumulative impact of assessing and responding to EIS documents, let alone the potential cumulative impact on housing, waste disposal, water consumption, health, and transport. Some smaller local councils do not do due diligence and do not adequately represent or protect residents most impacted.

There are many unacceptable holes in the Hills of Gold Wind Farm EIS and EIS Amendments. Our members have raised these concerns repeatedly and as far as we know they remain unacknowledged by the developer or DPE.

Tamworth Regional Council has submitted two Objections to Hills of Gold Wind Farm. The most recent Objection in October 2022 details unresolved impacts regarding maneuvering Oversize Overmass vehicles on existing narrow roads, across a floodplain and heritage curtilage, unexplained ongoing access, and causing vegetation and biodiversity loss.

If the Transport associated with a proposal is not resolved after nearly six years, surely there must be a mechanism to stop wasting community time and emotion, and direct government resources to more viable proposals. How can a local council be asked to sign an in principle VPA for such an unresolved development, and potentially take on unknown liability on behalf of ratepayers.

Problematic issues regarding Transport for Hills of Gold Wind Farm are provided below:

- OSOM access proposed across a high hazard floodplain at the entrance to a heritage tourism town.
- Evidence of Neighbour Agreements for blade trespass from port to project not provided.
- Location of planned car park near Nundle not provided.
- Load weights not assessed for two major bridges over Peel River. Replacement unknown.
- Information regarding possible replacement of two bridges over Oakenville Creek not provided.
- Inaccessibility of Barry Rd due to sinkhole not addressed at all.

- Evidence of access across Crown Land, subject to a Local Aboriginal Lands Council claim, not provided.
- Engineering not provided for steep internal roads, Western Connector Track and Transverse Track. Extent of cut and fill, shotcreting, batters, and retaining walls not transparent.
- Proposed internal access tracks crossing public road, Morrison's Gap Road, and turbines neighbouring the road not addressed at all.
- Transparent detail about mountaintop removal for infrastructure construction not provided. Consequently, environmental impact is not known.
- Visual Impact of internal road construction not provided.
- Transparent Capital Investment Value not provided.

### **Recommendations**

- Social licence should be defined so that it can be measured and respected by the federal and state governments.
- Renewables developers should involve local land owners in determining whether a proposal is welcome in a community, and if not, go away.
- Renewables developers should be transparent when scouting sites for renewables developments and remove the need for secrecy.
- There should be mandatory early notification of all neighbours within 5km of a renewables proposal, with detailed maps identifying a landowners' property and the proposed project.
- There should be mandatory inclusion of approved Development Applications, Dwelling Entitlements and subdividable land on developers' maps.
- There should not be Sponsorship offers during the DPE Assessment process.
- The renewables industry should not overstate community benefits, such as ongoing jobs figures, and understate community impacts.
- Landowners should be protected by a recognised minimum standard contract for Neighbour Agreements and recognised industry standard for developer behaviour during contract negotiation.
- Introduce standard inclusions to determine Capital Investment Value to enable comparison between renewables proposals based on investment/MW to ensure value for consumers and taxpayers.
- Greater transparency regarding whether the DPE SSD pipeline is an approval process or genuine assessment process with the capacity for poor proposals to be removed.
- Local Councils should be provided with greater support to help them research, assess and respond to EIS documents and engagement with developers.
- Local communities experiencing departmental technical failure should be given public exhibition deadline extensions, just as developers are given multiple extensions to submit information.
- If unresolvable issues remain after an extended period of development and assessment, there should be a mechanism for ending the process to protect communities from ongoing damage.
- Prevent developers from publishing maps proposing renewables infrastructure without landowners' permission.

- There should be greater consideration given to protection of world biodiversity assets protected by state and federal government legislation. These are not assets to be traded.

**• What is needed to ensure best practice engagement is achieved in all future projects?**

While state and federal governments are calling on renewables proponents to engage with communities earlier and better, our members with five-and-a-half-years' experience engaging with developers Wind Energy Partners and Engie, prioritise appropriate siting of proposals away from people, and places of recreation, tourism, heritage and environmental significance, especially national parks.

Hills of Gold Wind Farm has already been rejected by the DPE twice.

1. It was not included in the New England Renewable Energy Zone. As the crow flies the southern boundary is about 12km north northwest from the nearest wind turbine.
2. The developer submitted EIS Amendments for public exhibition a second time, presenting alternative proposed transport routes because of the constraints of the steep terrain.

It has also been rejected by Tamworth Regional Council twice with Objections submitted during the EIS, and EIS Amendments Public Exhibition.

Hills of Gold Wind Farm sits outside three Renewable Energy Zones, New England, Central West Orana, and Hunter.

Inequity exists for communities in and out of REZes. Hundreds of rural communities will have to go through what we have been through – years of anguish, hundreds of hours and thousands of dollars put into, reading thousands of pages of documents, writing EIS responses, communication with government, hiring independent consultants, submissions to inquiries, presenting to community and protesting. The potential environmental and social cumulative impact is epic.

Why was Hills of Gold Wind Farm excluded from the New England REZ declaration? If it did not meet the state's requirements for the REZ, why should it be permitted to enter the NSW Planning system at all?

**Recommendations**

- Introduce no-go zones for renewables proposals to prevent inappropriate siting of renewables and giving greater protection of state and federally protected flora and faunas (mitigation and offsets don't prevent biodiversity loss).
- Introduce mechanisms to protect high value agricultural, environmental and lifestyle land.
- Prioritise appropriate siting of proposals away from people, and places of recreation, tourism, heritage and environmental significance, especially national parks.

- Introduce a Code of Ethics and Governance Arbitrator to ensure developers are working to baseline best practice.
- Introduce best practice for engaging Australian consultants and on site (not desktop) reports.
- Review the relevance of REZes if proposals outside of REZes are still able to progress through the DPE State Significant Development assessment pipeline.
- Review the inequity for communities created by different rules, prohibition guidelines, and financial benefits for proposals in and out of REZes.
- Introduce a Gateway to judge the appropriateness of developments before they enter the planning system and create a more arduous assessment for problematic proposals.
- Introduce an accreditation or licensing system for prospecting small scale developers who intend to flip proposals to larger developers.
- Introduce greater protection for Aboriginal heritage sites within project areas.
- If a proposal materially changes, ensure community protections are in place to enable exit from Neighbour Agreements and Voluntary Planning Agreements.
- Introduce requirements for Australian materials and manufacturing to keep a greater share of renewables spending onshore.
- Address decommissioning concerns by making decommissioning bonds mandatory.

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc members commend you for embarking on the federal Community Engagement Review and sincerely hope that its results create a more positive experience for rural and regional communities carrying the burden of renewables electricity transmission and generation.

We also hope it provides insight into the lived experience of landowners impacted on a daily basis by the burden of a renewables proposal they do not want, and developers who have not demonstrated best practice community engagement.

Yours faithfully,

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc executive

John Krsulja (chairman), Brian Tomalin, Selena Sylvester, Teresa Eather, Ian Worley, Natasha Soonchild, and Megan Trousdale