

From: Andrew and Marion [andrewandmarion@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 August 2005 9:46 AM
To: RRAT, Committee (SEN)
Subject: Submission - The Australian National Animal Welfare Bill 2005

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re The National Animal Welfare Bill 2005

Wind Farms world wide, and now in Australia, are killing and maiming a wide range of birds and bats. A number of the species killed are protected by law, however it appears the wind farms proponents and operators feel that they are exempt from such laws.

The attachments are photographs of the Wedge-tailed Eagle maimed at the Starfish Hill wind farm. Its injuries were so serious that it had to be destroyed. Three Wedge-tailed Eagles have been killed at the Starfish Hill wind farm. Dr Charles Meredith undertook a predictive mortality analysis of the proposed Yoloak wind farm and found that of 12 Wedge-tailed Eagles observed in the area 9 would be killed in the first 12 months.

In addition to eagles, kites, falcons and owls, water birds and sea birds, bats are killed by wind turbines. Wind turbines are proposed in remote areas which is often habitat for many non-urban species and as such a threat is imposed on a bird and bat group that would normally be removed from many human impacts. Concepts such as placing wind turbines offshore would only result in albatross, petrel, shearwater etc being killed.

The following is in support of action to prevent the killing of wildlife by wind farms. Section A provides information of bird and bat kills while section B describes new proposals in important bird areas. The information provided here is not all that is available and further investigation will reveal a considerable amount more.

In Australia there are two proposals that are to be placed in significant wildlife habitat areas and flight paths and if allowed to proceed would have a major impact on a diverse range of birds and bats. These proposals are for Bald Hills and Mussleroe Bay.

I have more than 27 years of bird watching in the Bald Hills area and coordinated the creation of the Bald Hills wetland. A wind farm is proposed for Bald Hills and at that it would result in the destruction of many birds and bats.

Please contact me if you require any clarification or further information.

Regards
Andrew Chapman
2 Beach Avenue
Inverloch 3996
Ph: 03 56741266
Fax: 03 56743732
Mob: 0438567412

A - SOME BIRD AND BAT KILL RECORDS AT WIND FARMS

Spain

An extract from the U.K Observer newspaper.

Research shows, however, that wind farms are killing far more birds than the public realises. A five-year study in California revealed that the Altamont Pass wind farm kills an average of 40 to 60 golden eagles a year, along with 'several hundred' hawks, falcons and other birds of prey.

In Spain, a report commissioned by the regional government of Navarra concluded that 368 turbines at 10 sites had killed nearly 7,000 wild birds in a single year, including 409 vultures, 24 eagles and 650 bats. In Germany, studies show turbines have killed dozens of rare red kites.

Above Martin Wright's head in Mid-Wales, a dozen of these elegant raptors glide among the unmoving turbines. Red kites are a conservation success story, brought back from the brink of extinction in this area, but two were killed at this small site alone last summer. Other rare British birds are also under threat as the turbines proliferate. There are 400 pairs of golden eagles in the UK and just 25 pairs of sea eagles.

A farm of 27 turbines, each 325ft high, at Edinbane on Skye has planning consent, despite RSPB objections that the site was too close to sea eagles and several breeding pairs of golden eagles, as well as merlin and hen harriers. All four species have the highest possible legal protection.

The RSPB told The Observer it accepts wind farms do kill 'some birds' and it has objected to plans for 26 projects since 1998. 'RSPB Energy is wholly unrelated to wind farm energy. Less than 3 per cent of its power comes from wind,' said Paul Jefferiss, the society's head of environment policy. 'While we support renewable energy as an important mechanism in eliminating climate change, which we see as a bigger threat, we do not compromise our conservation objectives.'

There is a feeling among RSPB officers, however, that it could do more to minimise the risks to birds. One officer, speaking anonymously, said: 'The fact is we don't really know what will happen. Developers do environmental assessments but they own the research. And consultants are under pressure from the energy companies for the right answers.'

Critics argue that without the necessary research, the RSPB is keeping its fingers crossed while involving itself in the green energy market. Naturalist and broadcaster Iolo Williams left the society five years ago. 'I have grave concerns about some of the things going on in the RSPB,' he told The Observer. 'They just don't know what's going to happen if all these wind farms are built.'

USA

LAWSUIT SEEKS REDRESS FOR MASSIVE ILLEGAL BIRD KILLS
AT ALTAMONT PASS, CA, WIND FARMS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE January 12, 2003

Contact: Jeff Miller (510) 663-0616 ext. 3 or cell (510) 499-9185
 Center for Biological Diversity e-mail
jmillers@biologicaldiversity.org

Richard Wiebe (415) 433-3200 or cell (415) 505-8793, e-mail
wiebe@pacbell.net
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Livermore, CA - The Center for Biological Diversity ("CBD") filed a lawsuit today against Florida energy producer FPL Group, Inc. (NYSE symbol: FPL) and Danish wind power company NEG Micon A/S for their part in the illegal ongoing killing of tens of thousands of protected birds by wind turbines at the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area ("APWRA") in the San Francisco Bay Area of California. Through their subsidiaries and associated entities, FPL Group and NEG Micon own or operate roughly half of the approximately 5,400 wind turbines at the APWRA. Each year, wind turbines at the APWRA kill up to 60 or more golden eagles and hundreds of other hawks, owls, and other protected raptors. These bird kills have continued for 20 years in flagrant violation of the Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and several California Fish and Game Code provisions. The lawsuit alleges that these violations and bird kills are unlawful and unfair business practices under the California Business and Professions Code.

"Altamont Pass wind turbines are causing extremely high levels of bird mortality along a major raptor migration route and are likely depleting eagle, hawk, and owl populations not only locally but throughout the western U. S.," said Jeff Miller, spokesperson for CBD. "We absolutely support wind power, but it is past time for the primary turbine owners, FPL Energy and NEG Micon, to address this problem."

"Altamont Pass has become a death zone for eagles and other magnificent and imperiled birds of prey. Recent studies have proposed numerous recommendations for mitigating the devastating effect of Altamont Pass wind turbines on birds, yet the industry is blindly charging ahead replacing existing turbines with new and much larger turbines without any requirement of effective preventative measures or remediation for ongoing bird kills," said Richard Wiebe, attorney for the plaintiffs.

The APWRA was established in 1982 on 160 square kilometers of private cattle ranches in eastern Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Due in part to the local abundance of raptor populations in the region, wind turbines at APWRA cause more bird deaths than any wind facility in the world, a result of poor planning that allowed wind turbines to be built along a major raptor migration corridor and in the heart of the highest concentration of golden eagles in North America. Wind turbines at Altamont Pass kill over a thousand birds each year, including up to 60 or more golden eagles, 300 red-tailed hawks, 270 burrowing owls, and additional hundreds of other raptors including kestrels, falcons, vultures, and other owl species. In 20 years of operation, the wind power industry has yet to implement any effective measures to reduce the killing of protected raptors or come up with meaningful mitigations to protect bird populations affected by the wind farms. In recent months, the County of Alameda approved repowering and renewed permits for the majority of the wind turbines at APWRA without conducting any public environmental review or requiring any meaningful mitigation measures to reduce or compensate for bird deaths. CBD and CALifornians for Renewable Energy filed a formal appeal of the permit renewals with Alameda County in November 2003.

The extraordinary numbers of raptor deaths continue unabated, due in part to the complete regulatory failure by federal, state, and local officials to enforce wildlife protection laws. "The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U. S. Attorney's Office, California Department of Fish and Game, and Alameda and Contra Costa Counties bear equal responsibility for the ongoing bird atrocity at Altamont for their failure to impose any meaningful mitigation requirements or protective measures on the Altamont Pass wind power industry," stated Miller.

To add insult to injury, the Altamont Pass wind power industry has been receiving massive tax credits as well as government cash grants funded by surcharges imposed on California's electricity consumers as part of the state's flawed deregulation plan, all of which serve to subsidize the killing of birds.

"The wind power industry receives tens of millions of dollars in revenue from California's consumers, as well as enormous tax credits and government subsidies, based on the perception that it provides 'green' energy, yet continues to kill thousands of protected birds annually," said Miller. "The Altamont companies routinely kill rare birds that are the natural heritage of all Californians, and take taxpayer subsidies home to Florida and Denmark." According to wind industry reports, the Altamont Pass fiasco has tainted public perception of wind energy and hampered wind power development, as concerns about bird impacts has delayed or discontinued other wind facilities.

The magnitude of bird kills at APWRA has been known since at least 1988, when the first of many studies of raptor mortality was published. To date, the industry has not implemented effective mitigation measures to reduce bird kills, protect and maintain existing bird populations, or to compensate for killing large numbers of birds from imperiled populations, despite numerous studies by the California Energy Commission, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, and others. "The birds have literally been studied to death, yet the Altamont Pass turbine owners have failed to take action to reduce the risk to birds of prey," said Miller. In fact some efforts at APWRA, such as a small mammal poisoning program, have actually increased the risk to raptors while also threatening other endangered species inhabiting Altamont Pass such as the San Joaquin kit fox and California red-legged frog. Recent research at APWRA determined that bird mortality has not lessened over time, that the industry's minimal mitigation measures have been ineffective, and that the actual number of bird deaths is likely 8 to 16 times the industry-reported number of bird kills.

The lawsuit, filed in Federal District Court in San Francisco, is brought under California's Unfair Competition Law (California Business and Professions Code section 17200), which prohibits businesses from violating other laws, in this case federal and state wildlife protection laws, in the course of their business activities. The lawsuit also alleges that FPL has violated California's false advertising laws and the federal Lanham Act by making untrue or misleading statements in publicly asserting that it complies with all federal and state environmental laws.

The issue at Altamont is not wind power versus birds, but rather whether the wind power industry is willing to take simple steps to reduce bird kills. Raptor experts have suggested numerous measures to reduce bird deaths, including retiring particularly lethal turbines, relocating turbines out of canyons, moving isolated turbines into clusters, increasing the visibility of turbines to birds, retrofitting power poles to prevent bird electrocutions, discontinuing the rodent poisoning program, and managing grazing to encourage rodent prey away from turbines. Raptor experts have also suggested mitigation through raptor habitat preservation to maintain the stability of the bird populations that are being depleted.

Concerns about the potential for wind turbines at Altamont Pass to kill endangered condors recently scuttled plans by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to reintroduce condors into the Diablo Range east of Morgan Hill and Gilroy. The turbines may also be severely impacting local populations of the western burrowing owl, a declining species for which the CBD and bird conservation groups are requesting protection under the California Endangered Species Act.

The Center for Biological Diversity is a nonprofit environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats. The Center works to protect and restore natural ecosystems and imperiled species through science, education, policy, and environmental law. For more information about the impacts of wind turbines on raptors and the Altamont Pass issue visit <http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/swcbd/programs/bdes/altamont/altamont>

Jeff Miller
Center for Biological Diversity
San Francisco Bay Area Office
370 Grand Ave., Suite 5
Oakland, CA 94610
jmill@biologicaldiversity.org
www.biologicaldiversity.org
P:510-663-0616
F:510-663-0272

----- Original Message -----

From: "Dan Boone" <ddanboone@yahoo.com>
To: <ddanboone@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2004 11:09 AM
Subject: Scientific Am. article - When Blade Meets Bat

Hi,

I've attached a .pdf file containing the Scientific American (February 2004) article - "When Blade Meets Bat, Unexpected bat kills threaten future wind farms" - a very balanced and well-written summary of concerns at new windplants in WV and PA. A total of 475 bat carcasses were found during once-a-week searches of the 44 345-ft tall turbines from April through November at the Mountaineer Wind Energy Center, the sole windplant in WV.

This number of fatalities represents only a small fraction of the actual mortality; it is likely that over 3,000 bats died due to collision with the turbines in 2003 had the numbers missed by searchers or removed by scavengers been included. Unfortunately Florida Power & Light (FPL Energy) failed to follow their own written protocols for the post-construction monitoring of wildlife impacts at this WV windplant, and did not conduct a bat mortality study to accurately estimate the total kill - claiming they "require a strong business case to spend money on species that have no regulatory status..." (see: FPL West Virginia Site Survey Results on p. 6-7 at <http://www.nationalwind.org/events/wildlife/20031117/summary.pdf>).

But the USFWS sent the developer of this project a letter in 2000 that clearly expressed concerns about windplant impacts to both endangered and migratory species of bats, citing evidence of collisions with with turbines elsewhere. While the rate of bat kill at the WV windplant is extraordinarily high, another very high rate of bat mortality is also known from the only other industrial windplant in the southeastern US. At the Buffalo Mountain wind energy facility located atop a peak in the Cumberland Mountains of eastern TN, nearly 30 bats per turbine per year have been recorded since 2001. Except now for WV, the TN windplant's bat mortality rate still is 7 times greater than that found at any other wind energy facility - before or since. So the WV windplant on the prominent ridge known as Backbone Mountain is not alone in having a high rate of bat mortality.

Dan

FPL Energy veto stymies bat study, group says

By Jim Balow, Staff writer - Charleston Gazette [Charleston, WV] - June 8, 2005

A high-ranking official at FPL Energy has prevented follow-up bat research at the company's West Virginia wind farm, the head of Bat Conservation International said Tuesday.

Scientists with the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative, a group formed in late 2003 to study why electricity-generating wind turbines at FPL's Mountaineer Wind Energy Center in Tucker County are killing thousands of bats, conducted a variety of tests last summer at Mountaineer and another FPL site in Pennsylvania.

After finding large bat kills at both sites, the group proposed follow-up research this spring and summer, starting in April. "But at the last minute, Michael Leighton, COO of FPL Energy, decided he didn't want to do the research," said Merlin Tuttle, director of Bat Conservation International in Austin, Texas. Ed Arnett, a scientist who works with Tuttle, led the six-week research project last summer in West Virginia.

Leighton also vetoed plans for Bat Conservation scientists to do research at another FPL Energy wind farm in Oklahoma, at no cost to the company, and cut off access to all FPL sites across the country to Tuttle and Arnett, Tuttle said.

BWEC scientists released the 187-page report of their 2004 research on Sunday. It was the first comprehensive study of bat-turbine interactions. They found the 66 turbines at the two sites killed as many as 2,900 bats during the six-week study period.

The delay in research is especially significant because wind companies are scrambling to build more projects before the end of this year, when lucrative federal tax credits for wind power are set to expire. The BWEC scientists say wind projects on forested ridgetops - like those in the Appalachians - are particularly hazardous for bats.

"If the 900 or so turbines proposed are built in a 70-mile radius [of Mountaineer] prior to finding solutions, it's very easy to extrapolate from this data to close to 60,000 bats killed a year," Tuttle said. "That's very likely not an ecologically sustainable kill rate. It's urgent to find a solution.

"We advanced the state of knowledge pretty dramatically last summer," Tuttle said. "We were quite excited to find the kills are pretty predictable, happening on nights when the wind speed is low.

"The test we want to do is take every other turbine and feather them. To the average public, you essentially turn them off. The other turbines would keep running."

Every morning, scientists would check for dead bats under all the turbines, both feathered and normal. "By comparing mortality, we could see how much mortality could be saved by not powering up and we could measure how much it would cost the company in lost power generation.

"By not allowing this research to proceed, we have been set back one to two years in the most promising solution we have identified to date," Tuttle said.

"We don't know if it's a 50 percent solution or 80 percent or 95 percent if adjusted. We can't tell until another company builds a facility and starts killing bats."

FPL Energy spokesmen told the Gazette in April the company was planning to focus its research efforts this year on finding deterrents, and would not support all research proposals.

"FPL's position is for us to make money, we have to have the turbines turning," spokeswoman Mary Wells said Tuesday. "We feel research has to be focused on a deterrent, not on turning off turbines.

Spokesman Steve Stengel said FPL believes a deterrent, some sort of acoustical device to keep bats away from turbines, is the best way to allow bats and turbines to coexist. Deterrent testing is one of the types of research proposed by BWEC this year, he said.

"We offered the Mountaineer site for deterrent testing. BWEC said it could be done in a lab or in a cave. Hopefully the research is done this year," he said.

Tuttle questioned the sincerity of the company. "I have to ask: If a company doesn't want to test this simple procedure - it doesn't cost them any money, they just have to reprogram their computer - I have to ask if you would be willing to do something that will cost them money. They say they want to test deterrents, but deterrents will cost money." BWEC is trying to find other sites for its research, he said.

"We're not going to start up research at a site where the rug is going to be pulled out from under us halfway through. We had such good data at Mountaineer and Meyersdale. It would have been great to follow up."

Tuttle said Leighton's decisions have hurt his group's fundraising efforts. "It's a terribly embarrassing waste of time to go out and raise a couple hundred thousand dollars, say it is urgent, then go back and say we can't do the research after all; can we do something else with your money?"

"I don't want to attack the company. I think this is a bad decision by one person. It's just sad we've had this setback in what we're able to do. There are a lot of people who aren't going to want to step up and say as much, but I can tell you there are a lot of people in BWEC that are chafing at the bit at this decision by FPL Energy.

"I personally like wind power," Tuttle said. "But I can tell you if we start killing these thousands of bats these data predict, that's going to put a heck of a dent in the green image of the wind power. We need to get out ahead to prevent this."

To contact staff writer Jim Balow, use e-mail or call 348-5102.

----- Original Message -----

From: Jeff Miller

To: 'Jeff Miller'

Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 4:10 AM

Subject: Stop the wind industry attack on bird kill research!

Stop the wind industry attack on bird kill research!

Letters are needed immediately to support the CA Energy Commission's research on bird mortality at Altamont Pass and other wind farms!

There is an attack underway by wind power companies and electrical facility owners against scientific research conducted by the California Energy Commission (CEC). The CEC produced a June 2005 report, "Assessment of Avian Mortality from Collisions and Electrocutions," that industry is trying to prevent from being published or adopted. Because industry doesn't like the scientific findings or the policy recommendations that follow from them, they are attacking the science and scientists.

The wind farm owners in the Altamont are attempting to get the wind sections (Chapter 1 of the report) excluded from the CEC's proceedings on this topic, and prevent it from being published or having the recommendations implemented. The wind companies are inundating the CEC with comment letters attacking the report. CEC staff are addressing the details of those attacks, but they need general letters of support for the document.

The report is available at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005publications/CEC-700-2005-015/CEC-700-2005-015.PDF>.

Please write a letter in support of this report and its findings. Just a couple of paragraphs will do. Letters will become part of the official record.

Comment letters must be received by this Friday August 12. Send via e-mail (PDF documents are preferred) to docket@energy.state.ca.us and reference Docket Number 04-IEP-1G, and that you are writing in response to comments on the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report with respect to "Assessment of Avian Mortality from Collisions and Electrocutions," CEC-700-2005-015, by Melinda Dorn.

Hard copies can be sent to:

California Energy Commission Dockets Unit

Attn: Docket No. 04-IEP-1G

1516 Ninth Street MS-4

Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

If you have the need to contact the CEC Docket coordinator to be sure your letter is logged in properly, contact them at (916) 654-5076.

CBD comments on the CEC report and research:

1) The CEC's research has been crucial to identifying the scope of the avian mortality problem caused by wind turbines at Altamont Pass and elsewhere. The CEC has funded research that the industry refused to fund, despite the knowledge it was causing massive raptor mortality at Altamont Pass with no effective mitigation plan for reducing that mortality.

2) The CEC needs to stay involved in research in the future, not just at Altamont but throughout California as wind power projects are proposed

throughout the state. The CEC needs to continue research to identify effective mitigation for the next generations of turbines and proposed new wind power sites.

3) CEC staff and contractors have done a superlative job in conducting objective scientific research and providing critical information for resource and permitting agencies, including the CA Attorney General, CA Dept. of Fish and Game, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Alameda County. CEC staff and contractors should be commended, not attacked for their work.

4) The CEC has effectively communicated with all stakeholders throughout their research. For their watershed August 2004 report on Altamont Pass, CEC contractors met repeatedly with the wind industry and their consultants throughout their research period. They shared their preliminary results with industry in the year before publication of the report, gave drafts to industry to review before publication, and incorporated all industry comments.

Jeff Miller

Bay Area Wildlands Coordinator

Center for Biological Diversity

1095 Market Street, Suite 511

San Francisco, CA 94103

(415) 436-9682 ext 303

Fax (415) 436-9683

Web site www.biologicaldiversity.org

The Center for Biological Diversity protects endangered species and wild places through science, policy, education, and environmental law.

--

Japan

Andrew,

I take it you know about the 3 white-tailed eagles killed in Japan.

Mark Duchamp

Netherlands

Subject: [vostech] new Dutch study on bird mortality at windfarms: 28 collisions per turbine per year

<http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L05713904.htm>

Germany and Sweden

In a study for the California Energy Commission, one finds this at the top of page 12:

"Winkelman (1995) showed that fatality rates varied between 0.01. and 0.09 birds per turbine per day or 3.7 to 32.9 per turbine per year, depending on site and season. In a summary of avian impacts at wind turbines by Benner et al. (1993) bird deaths per turbine per year were as high as 309 in Germany and 895 in Sweden."

Australia

Thursday Island

----- Original Message -----

From: "Keith Platt" <kplatt@inews.net.au>
To: <andrewandmarion@bigpond.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2003 7:56 AM
Subject: wind farms

Andrew,

Thanks for all the correspondence. Just to add a bit of info to your recording of bird deaths: Two or three years ago (I'm a bit vague on dates sometimes) I was filming on Thursday Island for an ABC doco on Torres Strait. Thursday Is has two wind turbines which dominate the landscape. The turbines are built next to a communications tower which, like most towers on Torres Strait islands, is used as a nesting site by a pair of ospreys. However, one of the Tesltra technicians told us about an osprey killed by one of the turbine blades. I can't recall if he said two had died. The turbines are on the island's highest, windiest spot. The birds we watched swooped in and out of the communications tower and turbine blades, often seeming to have difficulty, especially the young, alighting or aligning themselves up with the structures.

There are two main communications towers on Thursday Is, on (almost) twin hills. Both towers are used by ospreys. I went up to Torres Strait four times over 12 months and saw ospreys on many islands, always using a communications tower if there was one available. Most islands have few trees, certainly none as stable or as high as a tower. As far as I know Thursday Is is the only island (so far) with wind turbines. However, if they are placed on other islands, danger to birds will increase. There are many species which migrate south (and return) each year across the Torres Strait.

rgds, keith

Starfish Hill SA

This Wedge-tailed Eagle in the attchement was found by a group on a visit to the 23 turbine Starfish Hill wind farm. It was taken to a Vet who discovered it had so many broken bones and internal injuries that it had to be put down. Two weeks later a second Wedge-tailed Eagle was killed at the same wind farm it was found with its head cut off. A third Wedge-tailed Eagle has since been killed.

Andrew Chapman
Ph: 56741266
Mob: 0438567412

----- Original Message -----

From: Margaret Martin
To: Andrew Chapman
Sent: Friday, April 02, 2004 1:16 PM
Subject: Fw: Wind Farm Birds

Hi Andrew,

This email was sent to me in error by Michael Maros, the elderly father of Ammun Luca. Ammun is a member of our Eaglehawk group and has spent many hours of research on the impact of birds by wind turbines.

When Ammun found that we had sent you the confirmation of the deaths of the two eagles at Starfish Hill, he wanted you to have the photos - which you may use in any way that you like.

Please let me know if this email does not contain the photos when you receive it, as I am still a novice at using the computer!!

Regards from Margaret.
Margaret & Bob Martin
P. O. Box 71
Myponga SA 5202
Ph.08 8558 8271 or 0416 212 695

----- Original Message -----

From: Michael Maros
To: Margaret Martin
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2004 7:53 PM
Subject: Wind Farm Birds

Dear Andrew

I understand Helen Shanahan sent you a copy of the internal report of the eagle deaths at Star Fish Hill recently. I thought I'd follow up by sending you two photos of the injured eagle taken at starfish hill by a member of the Parawa Ag. Bureau who happened to be on a tour through the wind farm. These photographs may be used in any way you deem fit.

This eagle came down early September 2003 I(I believe the first). Geoff Ware the site manager for Toorong Energy at Star Fish Hill informed me that he had

photographs of the second eagle, which was killed, but of course would not release them.

Ammun Luca
Eagle Hawk Action Group

Codrington VIC

<http://the.standard.net.au/articles/2005/08/08/1123353240511.html>
Eagle's death at wind farm
By VANESSA BURROW
August 8, 2005

SCIENTISTS are investigating what killed a wedge-tailed eagle that was found dead at the Codrington wind farm.

The protected bird was found dead on July 1 about 40 metres from a generator at the wind farm operated by Pacific Hydro.

Company spokeswoman Clare Laffan said the bird of prey was taken to the Museum of Victoria where scientists and an avifauna specialist confirmed it was a wedge-tailed eagle.

"Their initial finding was that the bird was killed by a sharp instrument. The injuries are inconsistent with being hit by a (wind turbine) blade but we have queried that finding with the forensic specialists," she said.

"The bird was seen a couple of days before in the same place that it was found dead." Ms Laffan said any observations of the bird would be helpful in establishing what happened to it.

Department of Sustainability and Environment senior flora and fauna manager Andy Govanstone said he had not received any reports about a dead wedge-tailed eagle. Pacific Hydro was obliged to inform him of any injuries to animals, he said. But Ms Laffan said the Codrington wind farm did not have any conditions attached to it about informing the DSE about bird deaths.

Pacific Hydro's proposed 70-turbine wind farm at Yaloak near Ballan did not receive State Government planning approval because of the danger it posed to wedge-tailed eagles.

However, Minister for Planning Rob Hulls did not rule out approving a modified proposal.

Woolnorth TAS

One Wedge-tailed Eagle (the Tas race is classed as endangered) and many sea birds.

-

B - NEW WIND FARM PROPOSALS IN IMPORTANT HABITATS

Bulgaria

BSPB/BirdLife Bulgaria

Thousands of White Storks pass above Bulgaria's Northern Black Sea Coast on migration

Zoom In

Bulgarian windfarms threaten migratory birds 04-08-2005

More than half a million European birds will be at risk as they soar along Bulgaria's Northern Black Sea Coast on migration after the Bulgarian Minister of Environment and Water gave the go-ahead for three wind-farm developments at Cape Kaliakra, a BirdLife-designated Important Bird Area (IBA).

The Bulgarian Society for the Protection of Birds (BSPB)/Birdlife Bulgaria and other conservation NGOs had lodged an appeal against approval of the projects, but Arsenova overruled it, giving the go-ahead for at least 80 wind turbines, each 120 m tall, to be constructed at Cape Kaliakra.

"More than 500,000 soaring birds-pelicans, cranes, buzzards eagles, and storks-will be at risk when they face a whirling wall of death. This is Europe's second largest soaring bird migration route and these birds come from all over northern Europe; Bulgaria has an international obligation to protect them." -Dr Nikolai Petkov, Director of Conservation, BSPB/BirdLife Bulgaria

"BSPB is not opposed to wind energy developments, which we believe can help in preventing climate change and global warming, but we are concerned that wind turbines should be built in places where they won't have a negative impact on nature. What worries us about the Kaliakra proposal is the geography of the location, when birds flying east to west along the coastline will pass through the path of the turbines," Dr Petkov added.

An environmental impact assessment (EIA) on the development failed to consider alternative project areas or note the site's Important Bird Area (IBA) status.

"The EIA experts also seem to have ignored the recommendations of the Bonn Convention resolution on windfarms and Bern Convention reports," said Petkov. "Bulgaria is an Accession Country, and this case would be in clear breach of the European Union's Habitat Directive, which requires precautionary measures to be taken to avoid damage to key conservation sites."

Official statements by BSPB/BirdLife Bulgaria and other conservation NGOs-the Bulgarian Association of Alternative Tourism and the National Natural History Museum-opposing the development, plus additional statements against the project from all Institutes of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, have been ignored by the Ministry of Environment and Water (MoEW).

BSPB/BirdLife Bulgaria now plans to launch an appeal in the regional court against the MoEW decision, and is considering lodging formal complaints with European institutions to put international pressure on the Bulgarian Government to comply with European Union conservation legislation, and on the project's investors.

Lewis Scotland
Windfarm plans on Lewis Island

The Eisgein Wind Farm is proposed on a site almost entirely composed of active blanket bog and Atlantic wet heath (both Annex I of the EU Habitats Directive). The site is also an IBA classified by BirdLife International for its Golden Eagle population. The developer's habitats and hydrology survey is cursory, and has no regard for recent developments in the understanding of the impact of wind farms in peatland areas. Bird species at the site include Redthroated Diver, Black-throated Diver, White-tailed Sea Eagle, Golden Eagle, Merlin, Golden Plover, and Dunlin (all Annex I Birds Directive). The Black-throated Diver, White-tailed Sea Eagle, and Dunlin populations are of national importance, and likewise its population of Greenshank (Annex II Birds Directive). Like the rest of the island, the Park IBA also serves an important function in the north-east Atlantic migratory flyway of waterbirds. The site's Golden Eagle population is of international importance and the potential impact of this project on Golden Eagle is of extreme concern. Park IBA hosts the second highest density of this species in the European Union. It meets the UK selection criteria for SPA classification but has not been so classified, contrary to Article 4.1 Birds Directive. Golden Eagle is known to be particularly vulnerable to wind turbine impact and is already under stress at the site due to significant habitat deterioration in recent years (overgrazing by Red Deer).

The Eisgein Wind Farm developer plans further severe deterioration of this internationally important Golden Eagle habitat. The developer predicts that death by blade strike, breeding range abandonment, population attrition; habitat loss, reduction in prey, disturbance, and reduction in productivity are likely. Wind turbines do not have to be located in Important Bird Areas. Plenty of alternatives exist. The Lewis Windpower Scheme proposed for Northwest Lewis has received about 5000 objections, at least 3200 of which were sent from Lewis addresses. For more information contact Paul Smith: Paul.Smith@scotland.gsi.gov.uk or visit www.mwtlewis.org.uk

Australia

Bald Hills

Bald Hills is an area I know well having been involved in establishing reserves in that area and bird watching at that location for over 27 Years.

Over 160 species are recorded in the area with 43 listed as migratory under the EPBC Act and 2 Nationally Endangered, 17 listed under the Flora and Fauna Gaurantee Act and 8 listed under CAMBA and 8 Listed under JAMBA.

The following are extracts from the submission by Andrew Chapman to the panel of April 04.

Specific Comment on Some Birds Of the area

The following birds are worthy of specific comment because they are recorded in the Bald Hills area, have been included in the biodiversity studies of the district and yet have not been considered, adequately considered or are omitted in the EES.

White-bellied Sea-eagle

White-bellied Sea-eagles live at Anderson Inlet and have been observed for many years by experienced and novice bird watchers. Their nesting locations include Nolan's Bluff and near Powneys Road to the north of the Inverloch-Tarwin Lower Road at a distance of approximately 3 kilometres inland from the Inlet.

On the 3 September 2003 while there was a field day/public meeting at Bald Hills Wetland Reserve a White-bellied Sea-eagle flew close by and was observed by a number of people attending.

The Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act provides an Action statement (No 60) for the White-bellied Sea-eagle. The White-bellied Sea-eagle is listed as migratory under the EPBC

The White-bellied Sea-eagle is also covered by the China Australia Migratory Bird Agreement - CAMBA

The information about White-bellied Sea-eagles in the Flora and Fauna Report is incorrect and the conclusions are wrong.

Swift Parrot

From 1976 each Spring I have observed Swift Parrots in Inverloch as they pass through on migration to Tasmania and in 1977 and 1978 recorded the observations for the Bird Atlas. Eulalie Brewster has observed and recorded Swift Parrots around Inverloch for many years and Barry Hill has observed returning birds passing through Koonwarra in autumn. Anthea Whitelaw recorded Swift Parrots at Wonthaggi Heathlands on 5 October 1997. Swift Parrots were also recorded in Inverloch by the Bird Observers Club over Easter 1976 and Inverloch (Emison et al. 1987).

My most recent observation of Swift Parrots in Inverloch were on 13 Sept, 15 Sept and 22 October 03 where birds were around Manna (*Eucalyptus viminalis*) and Swamp Gums (*Eucalyptus ovata*). A single bird was seen in Messmate (*Eucalyptus obliqua*) at the Bald Hills Wetland Reserve on 28 September 03. The records of Swift Parrots at Phillip Island result from two dead birds, apparently from collision, being handed in to Phillip Island Nature Park (pers com Dr Peter Dann).

Inverloch does not appear to be a staging point for Swift Parrot migration and they travel further south probably using the suitable eucalypt feeding areas at Tarwin Lower, Bald Hills, Buffalo, Walkerville and Cape Liptrap or Wilson's Promontory before flying to Tasmania. The coastal reserve vegetation does not provide suitable food for Swift Parrots at the time of year they pass through. These Swift Parrots probably winter in Melbourne, central Victoria or central NSW.

The Swift Parrot is identified as a listed Endangered Species for Bald Hills in the EPBC database.

The Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act provides an Action statement (No 169) for the Swift Parrot. This species is also subject of a Recovery Plan.

Brett Lane & Associates comment about Swift Parrots in South Gippsland is wrong and not supported by frequent observation by recognised field naturalists.

Great Egret (*Ardea alba*), Intermediate Egret (*Ardea intermedia*) and Little Egret (*Egretta garzetta*)

The EES does not record any egrets even though all of the three egrets have been recorded by bird observers visiting the Bald Hills Wetlands. SGCS/FWD 1980 Bird List records Great and Little Egrets, Parks Victoria 1999 Bird List records Great and Little Egret and the Bird Hide Books record Great and Intermediate Egrets. All three egrets are listed for the district in the Australian Bird Atlas.

Egrets use the freshwater wetlands of the Bald Hills Wetland Reserve and the surrounding areas when conditions are suitable, that is following heavy rains

when there is widespread flooding. The King's Flat Flora Reserve contains small wetland areas that would also provide suitable habitat. Given the status of egrets in Victoria, Bald Hills is an important area for this species and every endeavour should be made to protect them. Bald Hills Wetland was specifically set up to provide breeding areas for birds such as egrets.

Under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act an Action Statement (No 120) is provided for the Egrets that is aimed at assisting their recovery. The importance of Bald Hills Wetland can be highlighted by the following sentence from within the Action Statement. "...95% of Deep Freshwater Marshes have been lost in South Gippsland (Corrick 1981) while 30% of Deep Freshwater Marshes have been lost across the state (NRE 2000C)."

Great Egrets are listed by the EPBC and are covered by an international treaty between Japan and Australia (JAMBA) and between China and Australia (CAMBA).

The failure of the EES to identify the presence of this group of birds is considered a serious omission.

Cattle Egret

Brett Lane and Associates also do not record the Cattle Egret even though it has been recorded in all the bird lists for the district and is considered relatively common.

Cattle Egrets are listed by the EPBC and are covered by an international treaty between Japan and Australia (JAMBA) and between China and Australia (CAMBA).

Yet another omission in the EES.

Orange-bellied Parrot

Orange-bellied Parrots are found sporadically at points along the Victorian coast indicating that they move from one suitable place to another during the winter period. They have been recorded at the Powlett River and Anderson Inlet and Corner Inlet. Bald Hills is between areas of suitable habitat. The fewer records away from the central Victorian coast is more likely to be a result of a lower survey effort.

When Brett Lane and Associates refer to the six Orange-bellied Parrots at Point Smyth the actual observers, Anthea and Jim Whitelaw, say that their records from Anderson Inlet are from a location much closer to Bald Hills than Point Smyth. A number of locations around Anderson Inlet provide high quality feeding habitat for Orange-bellied Parrots.

There are records of parrots feeding on introduced grasses on a golf course on Swan Island and on pasture weeds so, contrary to the opinion of Brett Lane & Associates they could feed on pasture in the Bald Hills area. They are certainly likely to pass through from time to time when moving between coastal salt marshes.

The Orange-bellied Parrot is recorded as a listed endangered species for Bald Hills on the EPBC database.

Under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act an Action Statement (No 43) is provided for the Orange-bellied Parrot. This species is also subject of a Recovery Plan.

It is also listed as endangered under JAMBA.

Dr Peter Menkhorst's view is that the proposed Bald Hills wind farm presents a risk to the species that we should not take.

Ground Parrot

Ground Parrots are reported as being relatively common at locations around Bald Hills and King's Flat. A look at the Parks Victoria Bird List for the Bald Hills Wetland Reserve would have indicated that it was in the area. Also I'm sure a number of farmers in the area could have indicated how frequently it could be observed.

The Ground Parrot is listed under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act. It is also listed as endangered under JAMBA.

The ground Parrot is simply not recorded in the EES and so no assessment of likely effects is made. As it is listed under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act it is yet another serious omission in the EES assessment.

White-throated Needle-tail

The report acknowledges that there could be a loss of 24 White-throated Needle-tails per year for 52 turbines. The mortality risk identified in the report is for a species that is covered by international treaties between Japan and China and Australia (JAMBA and CAMBA) and listed under the EPBC Act.

These agreements, or treaties, are clear and unambiguous and there is an obligation to establish sanctuaries, preserve and enhance the environment of migratory birds and to seek means to prevent damage to migratory birds and their environment. There is no provision within these treaties to allow White-throated Needle-tails to be killed by wind turbines.

It is a serious omission that Brett Lane and Associates failed to record in the Flora and Fauna report that killing White-throated Needle-tails would be in breach of these treaties.

Latham's Snipe

Latham's Snipe is recorded in the Westernport Bird Observers Club list for the Bald Hills Reserve and the Parks Victoria bird list for the Bald Hills Reserve.

Two Latham's Snipes were recorded at a brief visit to the Kings Flat Flora Reserve at about 5.00 pm on 14 September 2003. Latham's Snipe is listed under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act as a Migratory Species.

This species has been identified by Brett Lane & Associates in their survey work as being outside their proposed wind farm sites. Farmers in the area are aware of the presence of this species as it is locally common so it is highly probable that it would frequently travel across the wind farm area. Failing to address the risk to this species is yet another serious omission.

Page 41 of the Flora and Fauna report lists Latham's Snipe as being recorded on the wind farm site and yet on the very next page, 42, states that Latham's Snipe was not recorded on the wind farm site.

Latham's Snipe is listed under the EPBC and protected under the CAMBA and JAMABA treaties.

Short-tailed Shearwater

The Short-tailed Shearwater is mentioned in the Flora and Fauna report text on page 8, however it is discounted because "none of these species fly overland". At Woolnorth in Tasmania from 19/7/02-18/7/03 6 wind turbines on land have killed 3 Common Diving Petrel, 2 Short-tailed Shearwater and a White-faced Storm Petrel, so wind turbines on land do kill sea birds and in particular they kill Short-tailed Shearwater.

The Short-tailed Shearwater is protected under the JAMBA treaty and listed as migratory under the EPBC Act

Waders

There numerous migratory waders, previously listed, that use Port Phillip, Western Port, Anderson Inlet and Shallow and Corner Inlets and they regularly move between these areas during the period they are in Australia.

These species have not been addressed by Brett Lane & Associates even though the group has the highest level of protection of all birds.

Waders are covered by the EPBC, JAMAB, CAMBA and a number are listed under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act.

Others

The following important bird species recorded from the area between Tarwin Lower and Walkerville ie the Bald Hills District but are not mentioned in the EES Flora and Fauna Report.

Barking Owl - listed under F&FG Act, Action Statement No 116

Glossy Black Cockatoo - listed under F&FG Act

Freckled Duck - - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act and listed under F&FG Act, Action Statement No 105

Blue Billed Duck - - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act and listed under F&FG Act, Action Statement No 174

Powerful Owl - listed under F&FG Act, Action Statement No 92

Hooded Robin - listed under F&FG Act, Action Statement No 09

Ballion's Crake - listed under F&FG Act

Gull-billed Tern - listed under F&FG Act

Australasian Bittern - listed under F&FG Act

Musk Duck - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act

Australasian Shoveller - Migratory under the EPBC Act

Black Falcon - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act

Cape Barren Goose - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act

Hardhead - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act

Nankeen Night Heron

Royal Spoonbill

Black-faced Cormorant - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act

Fork-tailed Swift - listed as migratory under the EPBC Act and listed under JAMBA

Significant Birds Recorded but not Addressed in the EES

The above list was taken from readily available publications.

The numerous species listed above have not been addressed even though they are considered significant by other avifauna authorities.

Brett Lane & Associates clearly has not used readily available information nor undertaken an appropriate level of field survey to record species that exist in the area.

The information provided about bats is no better because they have failed to acknowledge the presence of Grey-headed Flying Foxes even though they are frequently seen along the South Gippsland coast. They are also listed under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act.

EES Attempt to Diminish Conservation Significance of Bald Hills

The EES Flora and Fauna Report says at Section 4.3 page 42 "A handful of listed migratory species occurs on the site (see last paragraphs of section 4.2.5) but none of these is threatened on a state or national level."

The term "handful" is not a scientific term and it can only be assumed that the author employed it to sway a reader's view. This coupled with the failure to record species and dismissing the occurrence of species in the area, even though they are frequently observed, seriously underestimates the Bald Hills area's value for wildlife. Further discussion by the author based on this bias implies minimal wind farm impact on bird species and numbers.

There are many bird and bat species in the Bald Hills area that have high conservation significance as can be seen in the biodiversity reports for the area.

Summary

The following have been established from through examination of relevant documentation.

Inadequacy of the Wind Farm Assessment Methodology

The methodology adopted by Brett Lane & Associates is lacking in a number of ways.

- The field work is inadequate.
- The wetland environment has not been addressed.
- The range of avifauna movements have not been identified or considered.
- Readily available information about birds has not been used.
- The impact assessment is based on inadequate base line information for birds and bats.
- Turbines would cause avoidance in the Conservation Reserves and Coast Park.
- The minimal survey and data search has avoided recording many species with statutory protection.
- No correction has been made for the dry conditions at the time of survey.
- Assumptions about species such as the White-bellied Sea-eagle, Swift and Orange-bellied Parrots and others are simply incorrect.
- After suggesting the mortality would be low the EES says "It is recommended that a monitoring program be initiated if the proposed wind farm has a

significant impact on birds." A clear indication of deficiencies in the survey and assessment work.

If the field study and data collection is not adequate then no matter how much science is applied the results cannot be improved beyond the limits of the available data. It is a further problem that the impact assessment calculations are wrong.

Biodiversity

Biodiversity planning for the area, which provides a land use framework for the conservation of wildlife species, has been undertaken on a regional basis and for three landholders abutting or near the wind farm site.

The proposed wind farm will break up the connectivity that currently exists between the bushland areas between the Bald Hills Wetland Reserve and the Cape Liptrap Coastal Park and place a barrier across the path between Victoria's major coastal wetlands. The wind farm is inconsistent with the biodiversity planning for this important wildlife area.

Obligations Under International Agreements

Australia has obligations under the:

- Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals,
- Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of Japan for the Protection of Migratory Birds in Danger of Extinction and their Environment and
- Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of the People's Republic of China for the Protection of Migratory Birds and their Environment.

These treaties contain prescriptions for the preservation and protection of migratory and endangered migratory species. For example relevant sections of JAMBA are as follows:

"Article III

1. Each Government shall take special protective measures, as appropriate, for the preservation of species or subspecies of birds which are in danger of extinction.
2.
3.

Article IV

1.
2.
3. Each Government shall encourage the conservation of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction.

Article V

Each Government shall endeavour to establish sanctuaries and other facilities for the management and protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction and also of their environment.

Article VI

Each Government shall endeavour to take appropriate measures to preserve and enhance the environment of birds protected under the provisions of this Agreement. In particular, it shall:

- (a) seek means to prevent damage to such birds and their environment;
- (b)
- (c)"

CAMBA has similar articles. If a wind farm is to kill listed birds it would be in breach of these treaties.

The national EPBC Act and State FFG and Wildlife Acts require the protection of wildlife by proponents of development projects and decision makers alike.

There are a large number of species recorded as using or passing through the Bald Hills area that are listed as migratory and/or threatened and the panel has an obligation to act in accordance with statutes and protect these species.

The Panel considering the EES made the following comments.

The Panel does not as a general comment consider that the bird assessment as presented to the Panel entitles the Panel to conclude that the proposal will not adversely impact on conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity within the development sites and surrounding lands. Further there is at this stage insufficient information to allow proper assessment against the criteria of no impact on species listed under the EPBC Act or the FFG Act."

...."Mr Lane concluded that the Lathams Snipe will not be significantly affected. Mr Lane provided no information on the habitat of the Lathams Snipe, no details of any sighting records in the region or any details of migratory routes or their relevance."

White-throated Needletails - "the Panel checked the calculation and has found that by way of a mathematical error, the 18 mortalities per year should in fact be 28."

"Mr Lane concluded that numbers are such that the White-throated Needletail may be affected each spring, but that the impacts are not considered to be significant at a population scale. Mr Lane provides no figures to support this contention other than to say that while the species is listed on the EBPC Act as migratory, it is not listed as threatened at either state or national level."

"At risk of labouring matters, the reports contained a number of data copying, presentation and mathematical errors that, whilst small, altered or affected the results of Mr Lane's work. Examples of relevant areas with variable figures included the number of species of birds flying at rotor swept height and calculations of mortality figures. A number of tables and figures were wrongly titled or labelled or acknowledged to contain the wrong data. Such errors, although typically small and simple, did not provide confidence as to the reliability of key conclusions in the reports, or of the team responsible for

compiling them. These in turn added fuel to community concerns about the adequacy of Mr Lane's work and the soundness of his conclusions."

"In considering whether the approach taken by Brett Lane and Associates was damaged by lack of logical structure, clear reasoning in selection and explanation of methods and accurate presentation of data, the Panel has considered the advice provided in the Best Practice Guidelines for Implementation of Wind Energy Projects in Australia. The Panel appreciates that this document has been prepared for the wind energy industry and understands Mr Lane to have been principle author of the relevant parts.

"The Panel trusts that future EES processes undertaken by this proponent and/or consultant will focus more fully on the need to credibly communicate to the diverse audience that comprises the user group for EES documentation."

"The exhibited EES and SEES natural environment documentation and expert witness reports were disaggregated, poorly structured and difficult to use. In the Panel's mind, these factors added unduly to community concern about this key subject matter. They have also added unduly to the work required to analyse and respond to the information provided."

"The Panel also has a concern that apparently useful guidelines have do not appear to have been followed. AusWEA as the wind energy industry peak body commissioned Mr Lane to provide some apparently thorough guidelines on ecological survey considerations for would be wind energy proponents. These guidelines take a precautionary approach and, for example, suggest the use of a wide range of possible data sources to indicate species utilisation and volume. However, Mr Lane has not used a number of his recommended sources and to this extent stands as not having followed his own apparently sound advice."

"The Panel has a concern that the philosophy of the bird analysis was insufficiently responsive to the precautionary principle."

..."the Panel considers that there is insufficient information to allow a credible general conclusion that there will be no material impact on bird species listed under the EPBC Act or the FFG Act."

"Turning to bats, the Panel notes a different circumstance and concern. In relation to the Southern Bent-wing Bat, the proponent has undertaken targeted evaluations and these have proved inconclusive as to utilisation. Nevertheless, it has not been suggested that utilization can be excluded, so impact remains possible."

"The Panel notes the possibility that the project may have an adverse impact on the Southern Bent-wing Bat because of the known presence of a colony at Arch Rock."

I suggest you obtain a copy of the EES to confirm these quotes.

It is hard to understand how the panel could have recommended approving the Bald Hills project and further how Planning Minister Mary Delahunty could have approved the project after a subsequent bird report still did not address the bird issues.

Regards
Andrew Chapman

Mussleroe Bay

----- Original Message -----

From: Andrew and Marion
To: NETTLETON/MOSLEY
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2005 12:45 PM
Subject: Re: Musselroe Windfarm, NE Tasmania

Geoff,

If they were finding it difficult they should have asked for help or something as simple as letters. I have written letters objecting to wind farms in Scotland and US at the request of bird people in those countries and for the last couple of years I've been communicating with people in Tas and they did not mention anything about needing support. People in Tas, of all places, should know support from other states can be given to help their conservation cause.

Regards
Andrew Chapman

----- Original Message -----

From: NETTLETON/MOSLEY
To: Andrew Chapman
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2005 12:08 PM
Subject: FW: Musselroe Windfarm, NE Tasmania

Dear Andrew

FYI. PLs note that the compromise was on the basis of "political realities"

Regards

Geoff

From: Carol Williams <cawillia@iinet.net.au>
Date: Mon, 18 Jul 2005 07:53:55 +1000
To: Eric Woehler <Eric.Woehler@aad.gov.au>
Cc: Geoff Mosley <mosenett@ozemail.com.au>
Subject: Re: Musselroe Windfarm, NE Tasmania

Dear Eric,

Many thanks for your email. I gathered this was the outcome and I am sure Birds Tasmania did Everything possible to get the best results.

Now, I am hoping that the great big transmission towers are not placed along a swag that once was old growth forests!

Thanks again.

Yours truly,

Carol G. Williams
Cc Geoff Mosley

On 17/7/05 8:08 PM, "Eric Woehler" <Eric.Woehler@aad.gov.au> wrote:

Hello Carol

my apologies for the delay in answering your indirect query that came to me via Mike Weston. Don Jones (our Secretary) is away on winter holidays.

The situation regarding the Musselroe Wind Farm is much too complicated and extended to describe in an email (I am not a touch typist and the story is long, convoluted and extensive)

Birds Tasmania argued and negotiated over a period of approximately 6 months to achieve an outcome that we believe is the best available given the political realities. There were some turbines moved out of flyways we had identified and an undertaking to adopt other mitigation measures.

The agreements were reached after extensive negotiations and were a compromise. We didn't get all we asked for, but then we achieved a considerable amount in the negotiations.

I am doubtful that any involvement at this by third parties will achieve anything. Contributions and assistance etc 6 months ago would have been appreciated. We have signed off on the settlement and are now working with Hydro re surveys and monitoring etc.

Please note that I am overseas and unavailable for the period 20 Jul-10 Aug.
cheers
Eric

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Fw: Attn birds of Tasmania
Date: Fri, 08 Jul 2005 07:34:09 +1000
From: Michael Weston <m.weston@birdsaustralia.com.au>
<mailto:m.weston@birdsaustralia.com.au>
To: Eric.Woehler@aad.gov.au

From: "Richard and Carolyn Donaghey" <ricdon@southcom.com.au>
<mailto:ricdon@southcom.com.au>
To: "Mike Weston" <m.weston@birdsaustralia.com.au>
<mailto:m.weston@birdsaustralia.com.au>
Subject: Fw: Attn birds of Tasmania
Date: Thu, 7 Jul 2005 20:10:06 +1000
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2900.2180
X-Text-Classification: real

Hi Mike

Carol Williams of the Tarkine National Coalition asked me to send this on.

Richard Donaghey

----- Original Message ----- From: "Carol Williams"
<cawillia@inet.net.au> <mailto:cawillia@inet.net.au>
To: "Richard and Caroline Donaghey" <ricdon@southcom.com.au>
<mailto:ricdon@southcom.com.au>
Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2005 12:31 PM
Subject: FW: Attn birds of Tasmania

Hello Carol and Richard,

I would be most appreciative if you could please forward this on to Birds of Tasmania for me - many thanks.

Carol

----- Forwarded Message

From: Carol Williams <cawillia@iinet.net.au>
<mailto:cawillia@iinet.net.au>
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 2005 16:45:47 +1000
To: <lisdon@bigpond.com> <mailto:lisdon@bigpond.com>
Subject: Attn birds of Tasmania

Dear Birds of Tasmania,

This is the only email address that I have for your group I hope it is correct! I have been in correspondence with Geoff Mosley from ACF who believes that migratory birds may still be affected by the new wind farm to be built at Musselroe in the north east of Tasmania.

He sent me this media release... And I would be very appreciative if you could reassure us that this new placement of the turbines is indeed not in the path of these birds.

Many thanks.

Yours sincerely,
Carol G. Williams

"Milestone reached in Musselroe Wind Farm approval 26 April 2005

Hydro Tasmania has reached a milestone in the approval of the Musselroe Wind Farm through an agreement with Birds Tasmania.

Birds Tasmania lodged an appeal with the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal against the 129-megawatt project over concerns for the birds that use the site of the proposed wind farm in the far northeast of the State.

Hydro Tasmania Manager Project Development, Gustavo Bodini and Birds Tasmania Chair, Dr Eric Woehler, said that agreement was reached on the issues under consideration following consultation between the two organizations.

Birds Tasmania had expressed concerns about how the wind farm could impact on the birds in the area,... Mr Bodini said.

As a result of our common objective to further reduce potential impacts to birds and to support the development of the wind farm, Hydro Tasmania has agreed to resite four of the wind turbines.

Hydro Tasmania is committed to the sustainability of our developments through stakeholder consultation and this has produced a good outcome for the project and the environment...

Dr Woehler said that both parties had reached a satisfactory agreement, which includes close monitoring of a number of turbines for possible effects on wading birds and waterfowl.

Birds Tasmania is committed to safeguarding native and migratory birds within Tasmania and we are pleased to be working in partnership with Hydro Tasmania to achieve this at the Musselroe Wind Farm,... Dr Woehler said.

The planned Musselroe Wind Farm will be sited at Little Musselroe Bay on the Northeast coast of Tasmania. The wind farm will comprise 43 three-megawatt wind turbines.

Hydro Tasmania has now completed the requirements for State approval and expects Federal approval through the Department of Environment and Heritage in the next few weeks.

Subject to final approvals, work on the Musselroe Wind Farm is expected to begin in mid-2006.

Released by Helen Brain for Hydro Tasmania, 03 6230 5746
Birds Tasmania contact details: Dr Eric Woehler, 0438 204 565"

----- End of Forwarded Message

Close submission

Regards
Andrew Chapman
2 Beach Avenue
Inverloch 3996
Ph: 03 56741266
Fax: 03 56743732
Mob: 0438567412



