

Issue	Supporting Material	Notes
<p>Bango Wind Farm (BWF) Ownership The executive summary of the assessment report contains false and misleading information. It states BWF is “a fully owned subsidiary of Continental Wind Partners and Wind Prospect Group”. The Department says they have copied the information supplied in the EIS. BWF made a false and misleading statement regarding their ownership in the EIS.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASIC register states BWF is 100% owned by Asia Pacific Renewables Limited located in Malta. • Asia Pacific Renewables has 3 subscribers/ owners (Softec Holdings, Credence Holdings and Postscriptum Ventures). • ASIC lists PREVIOUS ownership of BWF being WP Renewables and CWP Renewables • BWF lodged a form to ASIC #388 on 23 August 2016 – reason for lodgement – a company controlled by a foreign company”. This was EFFECTIVE from 31 December 2015 • However the BWF environmental impact statement dated 14 September 2016 (several weeks after the ASIC submission) and signed by Ed Mounsey states “to the best of my knowledge the information contained in the EIS is not false or misleading” –in this report it states BWF is a wholly owned subsidiary of Continental Wind Partners and Wind Prospect Group. This statement is false. • The BWF website still says BWF is owned by WP and CWP – this is false and misleading. • Department states they rely on information provided by BWF and that BWF signed a declaration to state the information was true. • The BWF have provided information to potential investors (on the internet) which states “From 2013 	<p>We brought this to the attention of the Department and they stated “ <i>the details of the Ownership / shareholding structure of the proponent is not material to the Department’s merit assessment of the application</i>”.</p> <p><i>We note that this report will be relied upon by other government departments as the source of truth. E.g. Federal govt for funding purposes.</i></p> <p>The department talks about risk and “performance based outcomes”. How are we to measure performance when we don’t even know who the owner is?</p> <p>If BWF have been deliberately deceptive to the government and the public, how can we rely on the accuracy of other information in the EIS?</p> <p>Will BWF and Ed Mounsey be brought to account for making a false statement regarding their ownership structure in the EIS?</p> <p>How is ownership not material?</p> <p>Screen shots can be supplied to verify all of this information.</p>

	<p>through 2015, CWP and its main shareholder Postscriptum Ventures bought out most of Wind Prospect's share of the joint venture, thus becoming the sole owner of the portfolio".</p>	
<p>Political donations disclosure form was signed in March 2011 – i.e. over 7 years ago.</p>	<p>We brought this to the attention of the Department and they stated that the Act requires disclosure at the time of the application.</p>	<p>How do we know this is a fair process without any interference? The form was signed over 7 years ago ! The form should be signed again when there so much time has elapsed between application and assessment. The ownership structure of the firm has also changed so a political donations form should be signed by the new owners of BWF.</p>
<p>Has the ownership been hidden as Wind Prospect Group have a press release on their website to state that KPN (a Thai Company) have agreed to invest in CWP Group through their firm Wind Energy Holdings as KPN has been the subject of scandal with their auditor refusing to sign off their annual reports and their Chairman extradited from Thailand.</p>	<p>Refer to announcements on the Wind Prospect Group website and media reports in the Wall Street Journal.</p>	<p><i>The issue of potential Thai ownership was highlighted to the Department in one of the submissions. Why was this not investigated?</i></p> <p>Given this is on the Wind Prospect Group website and they no longer own BWF, how is KPN related to BWF? Is this company behind Asia Pacific Renewables?</p> <p>Is this company a fit and proper company to conduct business with the NSW government?</p>
<p>██████████ raised key objections on health grounds. These concerns have been ignored. These health grounds are confidential but have been given to the Department.</p>	<p>Health listed as 8th most important issue raised with ~ 17 submissions raising concerns.</p>	<p>We did not have a response from the department and they did not consult our medical practitioners.</p> <p>We would like to know why our concerns have been ignored.</p>
<p>Livelihood. Our area does permit farm stays. This is not mentioned by the Department but was in the submission.</p>		<p>We have the dream to establish a farm stay when we retire. This dream will be shattered if the wind farms are accepted.</p>
<p>Our visual landscape is severely impacted – we are ████████ – one of the most impacted residences (1 out of 11) .</p>	<p>A "wireframe analysis" was conducted at our site. BWF considered us low/medium impact but the Department considered us High impact? How can we trust what BWF says? Are other farms who were not given a wireframe analysis similarly impacted?</p>	<p>Visual screening will NOT be effective and is effectively a joke. We are surrounded by turbines. They will be higher than the harbour bridge and the highest in NSW I understand. How can visual screening be effective? We called our property "Mountainview" based on the original (early 1800s) name given to the property. The</p>

	<p>We will have “wide ranging horizontal views across both clusters”.</p> <p>The only way to substantially mitigate the visual measures is to remove turbines according to the assessment. We only have “peripheral benefits from the removal of the recommended turbines”.</p>	<p>property was called Mountainview due to the scenic landscape.</p> <p><i>“The department acknowledges that this matter is finely balanced”</i> – if it is finely balanced we respectfully respect the department to consider the rejection of this wind farm proposal.</p>
<p>Traffic and transport</p>		<p>Has not been adequately addressed especially on Tangmangaroo Rd where we have a “dip” due to the creek which floods. This is a dirt road currently. This will be very dangerous.</p>
<p>A number of people not hosting turbines have entered into agreements</p>	<p>In the early stages of the project BWF dismissed all my concerns. They also stated that I couldn’t take any legal action until the farms had been built. They had a very bullying attitude.</p> <p>In the past 1 to 2 years, BWF were VERY keen to meet with me, especially considering I voiced opposition. As I had heard from others that they had been “offered” \$ for their support/ silence I avoided putting myself in this position and being silenced.</p>	<p>Does the \$ offered provided to my neighbours provide adequate remediation? Is the department certain that these residences have been treated fairly and equitably? Why does the department now count them as being “associated”?</p> <p>Have these Australians been treated fairly and equitably and has the department adequately represented their interests?</p>
<p>The valuation of our property will be impacted.</p>	<p>We have 121 acres</p>	<p>Why can’t a proper valuation be conducted so we understand exactly how the wind farms will impact our property? It is unfair that we read in the newspaper that our neighbour boasts of “getting gold in there them hills”(from the turbines) – frankly at our expense.</p>