

## Briefing Paper

Agenda Item No.:193.8

### Subject: EPA Board Policy on noise limits for wind farm energy projects

ITEM FOR DECISION

Author / Contact Officer: **Kerryne Barwick (Principal Legal Officer)**Date: **20 June 2025**

### Background

During evidence in the St Patricks Plains Windfarm appeal (the appeal) before the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (TASCAT), matter number P/2024/81, the Proponent challenged the interpretation presented on the EPA case of the Board Policy setting a noise limit for wind energy projects. Discovery of the documents behind the policy was made, which revealed that the decision of the Board was not correctly described in an EPA Board communique which published the decision.

The decision of the Board reflects the recommendation that was made in *Board Briefing Paper – Wind Energy Projects Noise Limits* (paper 140.6(a)) (**Attachment 1**). The decision was recorded in the Board Minutes 4 August 2020 - Meeting No. 140 (**Attachment 2**). The decision reads as follows:

The Board resolved to:

- Note that it had discussed the St Patrick's Plains wind farm proposal and determined that it was at a stage where it was reasonable to require them to meet the new noise limit criteria;
- Request the Director write to the Proponent to vary their Guidelines to include the new noise limit criteria; and
- Approve the use of **the new noise limit criteria of 35 dB(A) (LA90, 10min) or background +5 dB(A), whichever is the greater, for all new wind energy projects.**

This decision was published in *EPA Board Communique – August 2020* (the Communique) (**Attachment 3**) which reads:

The Board discussed and agreed to adopt as policy the proposed lower noise limit of 35 dB(A) at residences and land zoned for sensitive uses for new wind energy projects. This level is becoming the accepted standard elsewhere in Australia. The previous criterion for Tasmania was 40 dB(A), based on a New Zealand Standard. **The 35 dB(A) criterion, or background + 5 dB(A), will now be Board Policy for the assessment of new windfarm proposals.**

What was omitted is the methodology for measuring the noise limit (the reference to 'L<sub>A90</sub>, 10min'). Perhaps understandably, the focus appears to have been on the number, as the decision of the Board reduced the noise limit previously used in wind energy projects in Tasmania from 40 dB(A) to 35 dB(A). The briefing paper did not flag with the Board the significance of referencing L<sub>A90</sub> and that this was a change from the EPA's usual practice. Perhaps this explains why it has been overlooked in the Communique.

The EPA standard noise limit condition (taken from the compendium of [EPA Standard Conditions and Definitions](#) published on the EPA website) sets noise limits in L<sub>Aeq</sub>. It reads:

#### NI (PF): Noise emission limits

1. Noise emissions from the activity at any noise sensitive premises in other ownership and expressed as the **equivalent continuous A-weighted sound pressure level** must not exceed:
  - 1.1. [x] dB(A) between [eg 0800 hours and 1800 hours] (Day time); and
  - 1.2. [x] dB(A) between [eg 1800 hours and 2200 hours] (Evening time); and
  - 1.3. [x] dB(A) between the hours of [y] and [z] (early morning period); and
  - 1.4. [x] dB(A) between [eg 2200 hours and 0800 hours] (Night time).

The words **“equivalent continuous A-weighted sound pressure level”** is the long-form of  $L_{Aeq}$ . Its use derives from the [Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual – July 2008](#) (the Tasmanian Manual), which references  $L_{eq}$  as suitable in the majority of cases:

### 3.3 Varying noise levels and measurement options

If the amplitude of the sound power output of the source varies with time, then a suitable averaging technique or statistic that yields a concise and appropriate measure of the sound level is required. There are several alternatives that need to be considered when deciding on the appropriate statistic. If the sound level of the source in question varies, then the audibility is most likely controlled by the higher levels of noise which are best described by the higher percentile statistics such as the L10 (i.e. the noise level exceeded 10% of the time). On the other hand, if the noise from the source under investigation is virtually constant, any variation to the measured sound pressure level is likely to be from other sources and a low percentile statistic such as the L90 is appropriate. **The majority of noise sources tend to fit between these two situations where there is some variation in the sound output. In these cases the  $L_{eq}$  (i.e. the equivalent continuous sound pressure level) is generally used for such measurements.**

The  $L_{Aeq}$  measurement is also used in the [Environment Protection Policy \(Noise\) 2009](#). It appears in ‘Table I – Acoustic environment indicator levels’ (at page 11).

As a result of this miscommunication of the policy there has been confusing mix of guidance issued to subsequent wind energy projects in the assessment process; mostly as appears in the Communique: “35 dB(A) criterion, or background + 5 dB(A),” (silent on the method of measurement). But some advice has included the  $L_{A90}$  measurement descriptor.

Recent permits for Port Latta, Robbins Island and St Patricks Plains windfarms have issued with Board conditions that include a noise limit in line with the current standard condition (with  $L_{Aeq}$  expressed as ‘equivalent continuous A-weighted sound pressure level’).

See the St Patricks Plains condition below for example, as was approved by the Board on 2 July 2024, [Minutes - 2 July 2024 - Meeting No 183.pdf](#):

#### N6 - Noise limits

- 1 Noise emissions from the activity, when measured at any noise sensitive premises, expressed as the **equivalent continuous A-weighted sound pressure level** must not exceed the greater of:
  - 1.1 5 dB(A) above the  $L_{A90}$  of all other noise; or
  - 1.2 35 dB(A).
- 2 Where  $L_{A90}$  is the A-weighted sound level that is exceeded 90% of the time.
- 3 The time interval over which noise levels are averaged must be 10 minutes or an alternative time interval specified in writing by the Director.
- 4 Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Director, noise emissions from the activity should not contain any dominant or intrusive noise characteristics when measured or observed at any noise sensitive receivers as assessed in accordance with the Noise Measurement Procedures Manual. Where noise emissions from the site contain any dominant or intrusive noise characteristics at any noise sensitive premises, measured noise levels must be adjusted for tonality, impulsiveness, modulation and low frequency in accordance with the Noise Measurement Procedures Manual.
- 5 Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Director, all methods of measurement must be in accordance with the Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual.

Although the Communique has long since been archived, the policy in respect of wind energy project noise limits was replicated on the [EPA website](#) with the same error.

## Measuring Windfarm Noise

A substantial amount of evidence across the seven-day hearing of the appeal related to measuring wind farm noise. This is a complex area and what became clear is that **the way wind farm noise is predicted or measured can affect the result, and place noise sensitive receivers at greater risk of experiencing noise nuisance.**

Three noise experts gave evidence, including Javed Moazzam for the EPA. For the most part, the experts agreed with each other. Where they differed largely came down to their preference of guidelines, and the balance of risk to be borne by developers versus noise sensitive receivers.

The Proponent argued that the Board Policy should be interpreted as a limit measured in  $L_{A90}$  and that reference to the Tasmanian Manual should be omitted in favour of their preferred guidelines, NZS 6808:2010. This position was opposed by the EPA and the Appellant for the reasons described below.

**I summarise the evidence heard in the appeal as follows:**

1. To explain the difference between  $L_{A90}$  and  $L_{Aeq}$ : -
  - a)  **$L_{A90}$  means the A-weighted sound level that is exceeded for 90% of the measurement period.** Typically, in environmental regulation it represents the background noise level because it generally excludes fluctuating noise sources (i.e. noise present for less than 10% of the time monitored). The  $L_{A90}$  metric is commonly used to measure the level of wind turbine noise at a noise-sensitive premises rather than the  $L_{Aeq}$  metric because, *when operating correctly*, wind turbine noise is relatively steady and sufficiently low that other short-term noise sources in the environment (e.g. wind gusts, occasional vehicles, fauna) make it more difficult to measure in the  $L_{Aeq}$  metric. This is different from most industrial activity that the EPA regulates, although it is not only specific to windfarms.
  - b)  **$L_{Aeq}$  is the A-weighted equivalent continuous sound level**, used in acoustics to describe the average level of noise over a specific period, including the fluctuating sound levels during that time.  $L_{Aeq}$  is typically used in environmental regulation of industrial noise. As discussed above, it is the metric the EPA prescribes in the noise limit Standard Condition. Fluctuating sounds are often the annoying aspects of the noise described in environmental nuisance complaints (the random bangs and thumps that people find irritating or intrusive).

Wind turbine noise, although generally constant does contain some fluctuating noise levels e.g., when the wind speed or direction changes, or when curtailment measures are implemented, or during Identiflight shutdown of a turbine. Wind turbine noise can be measured using the  $L_{Aeq}$  metric, but it requires an acoustic consultant to be present to start/stop the data recorder or review the recording to omit extraneous noise (so it is potentially more time-consuming/costly).

2. The other Australian states have each set a noise limit measured in  $L_{Aeq}$  and have published their own guidelines in respect of measuring windfarm noise, except for Victoria who has adopted NZS 6808:2010 in their guidelines and which measures wind turbine noise in  $L_{A90}$ . This is set out in Table I below:

**Table I: Noise Limits Used in other Australian States**

Noise Standard	Receivers	Time Periods	Noise Limit	Descriptor
Queensland Planning Guideline State Code 23: Wind farm development (September 2024) <sup>1</sup>	Sensitive land uses (Non-hosts lots)	Night (10pm to 6 am)	35 dB(A)	$L_{Aeq}$
	Sensitive land uses (hosts lots)	Day (6am to 10pm)	37 dB(A)	
	Sensitive land uses (hosts lots)	Night (10pm to 6 am)	35 dB(A)	

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.planning.qld.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0033/96594/planning-guidance-state-code-23-wind-farm-development.pdf](https://www.planning.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0033/96594/planning-guidance-state-code-23-wind-farm-development.pdf).

Noise Standard	Receivers	Time Periods	Noise Limit	Descriptor
EPA <b>South Australia</b> Wind Farms Environmental Noise Guidelines (2021) <sup>2</sup>	relevant receivers in localities which are primarily intended for rural living	24 hour	35 dB(A) at	L <sub>Aeq,10mins</sub>
	relevant receivers in other zones		40 dB(A) at	
<b>NSW</b> Wind Energy Guideline – Technical Supplement for Noise Assessment (2024) <sup>3</sup>	Residential Receivers	24 hour	35 dB(A)	L <sub>Aeq,10mins</sub>
EPA <b>Victoria</b> Wind Energy Facility Turbine Noise: Technical Guideline (2024) <sup>4</sup> which adopts NZS 6808:2010 <sup>5</sup>	Noise sensitive areas	24 hour	40 dB(A)	L <sub>A90</sub>
	Premises subject to an agreement	24 hour	45 dB(A)	

**3. Measurements using L<sub>A90</sub> and L<sub>Aeq</sub> are not equivalent.** It is generally accepted that the difference between the L<sub>A90</sub> and L<sub>Aeq</sub> for wind turbine noise is between 1.5 and 2.5 dB over a 10-minute period. If you measure in L<sub>A90</sub>, as commonly occurs for wind farms, you need to add a mean correction value of 2 dB(A) to the measurement for it to be representative of L<sub>Aeq</sub>. This conversion is specific to wind farm noise.

**4. There is variance in how other jurisdictions manage the L<sub>A90</sub> to L<sub>Aeq</sub> correction factor.** In Victoria, the NZS: 6808:2010 deems them to be equivalent. The Proponent sought to rely on the approach in the NZS: 6808:2010. They argued that requiring a 2 dB correction factor in addition to setting the low 35 dB limit would mean that the limit in Tasmania was *in effect* 33 dB(A), much lower than any other state. This argument assumes that no other state is applying a correction factor.

The evidence presented indicated that other states take a more nuanced approach, essentially leaving it up to the developer or operator to show how their measurements in L<sub>A90</sub> demonstrate compliance with the L<sub>Aeq</sub> described limit. Importantly, this correction factor is only an issue where the post-construction measured levels are close to the prescribed noise limit. This should occur rarely, due to conservative modelling of the predicted noise levels during the assessment of the project.

As an example, I refer to the recent Cattle Hill Wind Farm noise monitoring. Although their permit does not set a noise limit at all, post construction monitoring was completed according to the EPA SA Guidelines measuring against a 35 dB(A) L<sub>Aeq</sub> (+5 dB(A) background) limit.<sup>6</sup> Measurements were submitted in L<sub>A90</sub>, but no conversion was required as the measurements were well below the limit (by 4-11 dB(A)) so it was obvious, without further calculation, that they were compliant. See Table 2 below.

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.epa.sa.gov.au/files/47788\\_windfarms.pdf](https://www.epa.sa.gov.au/files/47788_windfarms.pdf)


<sup>3</sup> <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/2024-11/wind-energy-guideline-noise-technical-supplement.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> [Wind energy facility turbine noise - Technical guideline | Environment Protection Authority Victoria](#)

<sup>5</sup> [D25-84460 - NZS 6808-2010](#)

<sup>6</sup> *Cattle Hill Wind Farm Operational Noise Survey Report*, prepared by Vipac Engineers and Scientists Limited – 3 March 2021 [D25-83851 - CHWF Operation Noise Survey Report 3Mar2021 - provided in confidence.](#)

**Table 2 - Cattle Hill Wind Farm Operation Noise Survey Results**

		Wild Cattle Hill Pty Ltd Goldwind - Cattle Hill Wind Farm - Commissioning Operational Noise Survey										
		Table 9-2 provides a summary of the background regression noise levels, predicted noise levels, noise criteria and post commission regression noise levels. Appendix G provides summary plots of the post and pre commissioning data.										
Table 9-2: Summary of predicted and post-commissioning noise levels (dBA)												
Location	Data	Wind Speed (m/s) at Hub Height										
		2*	3*	4	5	6	7	8	9*	10	11	12*
Walruna (M2)	Pre-Construction Background Regression	13	18	23	26	28	31	34	35	36	37	38
	Predicted Levels	-	-	-	-	24	26	29	-	31	33	-
	Noise Criteria	35	35	35	35	35	36	39	40	41	42	43
	Post Construction Regression	25	26	27	28	29	31	32	34	35	36	37
	Difference to Criteria	-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-7	-6	-6	-6	-6
Bashan and Kluan (M2)	Pre-Construction Background Regression	25	27	29	31	31	33	35	35	36	37	37
	Predicted Levels	-	-	-	-	28	31	34	-	36	37	-
	Noise Criteria	35	35	35	36	36	38	40	40	41	42	42
	Post Construction Regression	27	27	28	29	31	32	33	34	36	37	38
	Difference to Criteria	-8	-8	-7	-6	-5	-6	-7	-6	-5	-5	-4
Macclesfield (M1) (Closest residence)	Pre-Construction Background Regression	23	25	27	29	30	32	34	35	36	38	39
	Predicted Levels	-	-	-	-	44	47	50	-	52	53	-
	Noise Criteria	35	35	35	35	35	37	39	40	41	43	44
	Post Construction Regression	24	26	27	29	30	32	33	34	35	36	36
	Difference to Criteria	-11	-9	-8	-6	-5	-5	-6	-6	-6	-7	-8

5. **Criticism of NZS 6808:2010:** the evidence suggests this standard is more favourable to the developer or operator and presents greater risk to sensitive receivers.

- a) NZS 6808:2010 is a guideline only for wind turbine noise. It cannot be prescribed for measuring a single noise limit for wind energy projects as it cannot be applied to ancillary wind farm infrastructure (such as transformers). Prescribing separate limits for measuring turbines and ancillary infrastructure would be a departure from the usual EPA practice of a single noise limit for a site/activity, and dealing with windfarm noise in a piecemeal way can result in cumulative noise impacts.
- b) NZS 6808:2010 sets the noise limit using the  $L_{A90}$  metric. If the wind turbines are operating correctly and post-construction measured noise levels are under their conservatively assessed predicted noise levels, it makes no practical difference if they are measured using the  $L_{A90}$  metric. However, measuring using  $L_{Aeq}$  is more likely to detect fluctuating levels (that may also be dominant and intrusive characteristics), so setting the limit using  $L_{Aeq}$  allows the regulator to challenge the accuracy of  $L_{A90}$  measurements if necessary (e.g., where the wind turbines may not be operating correctly, where fluctuating levels or dominant or intrusive characteristics may be present, or where the measured limit is close to the noise limit).
- c) NZS 6808:2010 applies different adjustments for intrusive or dominant characteristics than appears in the Tasmanian Manual. See section 6, which is the only part of the Tasmanian Manual specifically prescribed in permit conditions (see above St Patricks Plains noise condition example

at subclause N6(4)). **NZS 6808:2010 adjustments are generally lower and do not include an adjustment for low frequency noise.**

The adjustment factor works by applying a penalty to the measured noise limit to account for the 'intrusive or dominant' characteristics detected. Where this pushes the measured level over a noise limit it should result in a regulatory response (if one isn't already prescribed in the permit). These characteristics are hard to predict, and assessment predictions may assume that no such characteristics will be present. Having a more robust adjustment factor provides better protection against the constructed wind farm causing noise nuisance to sensitive receivers.

- d) The earlier standard, NZS 6808:1998, is the standard the Tasmanian Manual is based on at section 17 – Wind Farms. It was the world's first specialist standard for wind farms. There has since been criticism of this standard in peer reviewed papers.<sup>7</sup> Not all these issues have been corrected in the 2010 version.<sup>8</sup> NZS 6808:2010 has also come under scrutiny in recent court proceedings; see the Victorian Supreme Court decision in the *Uren* case, where **despite compliance with the standard noise nuisance was found to have occurred.**<sup>9</sup>

Since NZS 6808:1998 was published other Australian jurisdictions (apart from Victoria) have gone in a different direction for wind farm noise regulation. Implicitly, so has the EPA, as our standard condition does not align with that standard (contributing to the confusion around the EPA position). Given the issues highlighted in the *Uren* case, and as discussed by the experts during the appeal, the EPA should no longer rely on this standard.

Comparison of the EPA SA Guideline (the *South Australian wind farms environmental noise guidelines 2009*) to NZS 6808:2010 shows the EPA SA Guideline is a the more conservative,<sup>10</sup> and therefore more likely to protect sensitive receivers from noise nuisance. The EPA SA Guidelines were updated in 2021 and is already in use in Tasmania for some projects (per the Cattle Hill monitoring example).

The EPA SA Guideline contains provisions for accounting for cumulative noise effects with other nearby wind farms.

In the opinion of Javed Moazzam, the SA Guideline is more representative of best practice for wind farm noise measurements.

## Present Situation

Wind energy projects are a rapidly expanding and evolving industry here in Tasmania and nationally. There is a need for Tasmania to be at the forefront of environmental regulation of this industry.

It was evident coming out of the hearing that the issue of the applicable noise limit for wind farms in Tasmania is more complex than simply correcting the record of what the Board determined in 2020. Presently our Manual, Policy, and Standard Condition are silent, uncertain or inconsistent on matters relevant to how wind farm noise is to be measured. This has resulted in inconsistent communication and assessment guidelines and leaves the assessment and conditioning of wind farm noise open to interpretation and dispute on appeal.

Clarification is needed in respect of:

- a) The noise limit and how it is measured.
- b) That the noise limit applies to the whole of the activity of the wind farm (turbines and ancillary infrastructure).
- c) How adjustments for conversion between LA90 measurements and an LAeq limit, and for special audible characteristics (dominant or intrusive characteristics) apply.
- d) The guidelines that should be used for both predictive and actual measurements.

<sup>7</sup> ['Nonsense on stilts', November 2009, by Phillip J Dickenson.](#)

<sup>8</sup> ['A new wind farm noise standard for New Zealand – NZS: 6808:2010', August 2010, by Dr Stephen Chiles.](#)

<sup>9</sup> *Uren v Bald Hills Wind Farm Pty Ltd* [2022] VSC 145.

<sup>10</sup> ['Comparison of compliance results obtained from the various wind farm standards used in Australia'](#) November 2011, by Jonathan Cooper, et al.

## Proposal:

What is proposed is a package of changes to ensure consistency across this issue which will include:

1. A new Board Policy be published to provide more precise and detailed information on wind energy project noise limits; and
2. A review and update of the *Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual*; and
3. Interim changes to the *Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual* to ensure consistency with the Board Policy until a full review is completed; and
4. A new Standard Condition for wind farm noise limits in line with the new Board Policy; and
5. A communications strategy to be developed to inform EPA staff and external stakeholders of the policy changes.

## New Board Policy

A new Board Policy has been drafted in consultation with noise specialist Javed Moazzam. That document is attached (**Attachment 4**).

The new policy includes all the important points identified for clarification.

The design criteria retains the wording 'the greater of either the noise limit or background +5 dB. This means that in practice the 35 dB(A) limit will only be relevant in low noise environments. Where the background or ambient noise is higher it will mask the noise from the wind farm provided the windfarm noise is no more than +5 dB(A) the background level.<sup>11</sup> This is consistent with the 2020 Board Policy, and consistent with the approach across Australian states. Nothing arose during the appeal to suggest a change to this is needed.

To ensure that the policy is implemented as the Board intends, a new Standard Condition has been drafted to compliment the policy, see attached (**Attachment 5**).

## Review of the Tasmanian manual

The Tasmanian Manual is clearly outdated (last reviewed in 2008) and has only a brief section in respect to wind farm noise that cannot be relied on alone. It was issued under the now repealed *Environmental Management and Pollution Control (Miscellaneous Noise) Regulations 2004* by Gazette. The current *Environmental Management and Pollution Control (Noise) Regulations 2016* has no provision for the making of a manual.

This means that Tasmanian Manual has no statutory authority, it is an administrative document that is 'called up' in our permit conditions (including EPNs, and ELs). It is listed on our [Policy Register](#) as a guideline or document endorsed by the Director. This makes amending the document a simple process of removing it from the website and then publishing the updated version (although consideration will need to be given to how any changes impact any current permit conditions).

Priority should be given to starting the Tasmanian Manual update project as soon as practicable; however, this will be subject to the available resources of the agency and it will take time to review all parts of the Tasmanian Manual before a completely revised version can be published. This is a matter for the Director to manage.

## Interim management

**In the interim it is proposed that section 17 of the manual, in respect of wind farms, be omitted and replaced with a page indicating simply that wind farm noise should be measured in accordance with:**

- a) **The EPA Board Policy for wind energy projects noise limits – issued [date 2025] (the EPA Board Policy); and**

<sup>11</sup> Assuming the wind turbines are operating correctly, however fluctuations of noise and special audible characteristics are otherwise accounted for in the methodology or penalty adjustments. But note the careful wording in the new standard condition (Attachment 5) on ambient noise.

- b) The EPA South Australia Wind farms environmental noise guidelines 2021 (or the most recent revised version of that document) except where this guideline may be inconsistent with the EPA Board Policy.**

This will resolve any ambiguity in respect of the intent or expectations of the Board.

In practice, the Tasmanian Manual is not used for compliance measurements, because the information is too brief to be of assistance. Instead, compliance reports are conducted in accordance with other guidelines. This change will clarify which guidelines should be applied which will improve consistency.

Importantly, revoking section 17 of the Tasmanian Manual will not affect the requirements in respect of the adjustment for special audible characteristics (dominant or intrusive characteristics) as this appears in the manual in a separate section (section 6). The new Board Policy emphasises that this adjustment still applies, which allows for consistency across EPA regulated sites.<sup>12</sup>

## Communications Strategy

Once the new Board Policy is approved, EPA staff will need to move quickly to;

- Publish the document, make the interim changes to the Tasmanian Manual, and add the new Standard Condition to our compendium of standard conditions; and
- Advise ReCFIT (Renewables, Climate and Future Industries Tasmania) and all relevant stakeholders including the proponents in all pending wind energy project assessments; and
- Update all website information.

**You will see that the start date of that policy is deferred to ensure effective communication of the policy before it commences**, especially with the proponents for existing wind energy project proposals.

## Impact on pending wind farm assessments

Catherine Browning has prepared a table of all pending windfarm assessments (**Attachment 6**).

You can see that each of the 10 projects we are aware of are in the early stages of the assessment, with none having submitted even a first version of their Environmental Impact Statement. Based on this information I do not believe any of these projects are so advanced that a change to the noise limit as suggested would impact their assessment (noting we have not changed the limit per se, but clarified our position on how it should be measured).

It should not change the predictive modelling in any event, only the interpretation of the modelling and whether it demonstrates compliance with the noise limit as expressed in the new Board Policy.

## Consultation

EPA Noise Specialist Javed Moazzam was consulted extensively, and the changes recommended derive from his considered opinion developed during the appeal as the issues in that case have arisen.

This proposal has also been workshopped with selected staff from the assessments and regulatory sections and the Director.

## Strategic Implications

Clarity for the sector going forward, and certainty regarding what the regulation of their proposal will look like.

## Financial Implications

None.

<sup>12</sup> There are variances in how penalty adjustments apply across the guidelines statewide. Arguably the Tasmanian Manual is more conservative in some respects and will offer greater protection to noise sensitive receivers. The benefits of it over NZS 6808:2010 have been referred to elsewhere in this paper.

Cost of this work is within the scope of EPA staff existing roles.

## Conclusion

These changes are necessary to ensure the integrity of the assessment process of wind energy projects going forward and minimise the risk of appeals arising from uncertainty of the noise limit design criteria or compliance measurements.

## Recommendations

That the Board:

- 1 Approves the new Board Policy (Attachment 4)
- 2 Notes the proposed new standard condition, the intended interim changes to the Tasmanian Manual, and communications strategy, which will support implementation of the new Board Policy.



Kerryne Barwick

**Principal Legal Officer**  
**ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Approved: 20 June 2025



Catherine Murdoch

CEO

Approved for submission to the Board on 22 June 2025

## Attachments

- Attachment 1 – *Board Briefing Paper – Wind Energy Projects Noise Limits* (paper 140.6(a))
- Attachment 2 – *Board Minutes 4 August 2020 - Meeting No. 140*
- Attachment 3 – *EPA Board Communique – August 2020*
- Attachment 4 – *EPA Board Policy – Noise Limits for Wind Energy Projects*
- Attachment 5 – *New standard condition for wind energy projects*
- Attachment 6 – *Table of wind farm assessments - May 2025*

# BOARD OF THE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

## BRIEFING PAPER

**Agenda Item No.: 140.5(a)**

**SUBJECT: WIND ENERGY PROJECTS NOISE LIMITS**

**ITEM FOR DECISION**

**Author/Contact Officer:** Tonia Robinson

**Date:** 27<sup>th</sup> July 2020

### **BACKGROUND**

#### ***Noise limits in Tasmania***

Over the past few years, EPA Tasmania has used the New Zealand Standard NZS6808:2010 *Acoustics – Wind farm noise* for wind turbine noise assessment, measurement and limits for wind energy projects undergoing environmental assessment in accordance with the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994* (EMPC Act).

The noise limit previously used for wind energy projects in Tasmania was 40 dB(A) or background +5 dB(A) whichever is greater, consistent with the New Zealand Standard. It is noted that the New Zealand Standard recommends a lower, more stringent limit during the evening and nighttime of 35 dB or 5 dB more than the background sound level, whichever is the greater, for high amenity areas<sup>1</sup>. The clarification of the locations where the more stringent limit would apply in the New Zealand context is determined by a local authority which identifies the need to provide a higher degree of protection of acoustic amenity for specific areas in its district plan. This is difficult to apply in the Tasmanian context as we do not have similar areas defined in Tasmanian planning schemes.

#### ***Noise limits in other jurisdictions***

In South Australia, the EPA's *Wind farms environmental noise guidelines*<sup>2</sup> propose a 35 dB(A) (LAeq,10 minute) limit at relevant receivers in localities which are primarily intended for rural living, and 40 dB(A) at relevant receivers in other zones. The guidelines define the 'rural living' zone as a rural-residential 'lifestyle' area intended to have a relatively quiet amenity. The area should not be used for primary production other than to produce food or crops, or to keep animals for the occupiers' own use, consumption and/or enjoyment. The noise amenity should be quieter than in an urban-residential area.

The NSW Government has adopted the South Australian 2009 guidelines, which form the basis of their regulatory noise standard and assessment methodology. However, NSW has supplemented these guidelines with criteria developed to address potential noise impacts on the amenity of residents and other sensitive receivers in the vicinity of proposed wind energy projects and has only adopted the lower base noise criteria in the SA 2009 guidelines:

*Predicted equivalent noise level (LAeq,10 minute), should not exceed 35 dB(A) or the background noise (LA90(10 minute)) by more than 5 dB(A), whichever is greater.*

<sup>1</sup> High amenity areas in the New Zealand standard refers specifically to a zoning adopted in NZ Planning law.

<sup>2</sup> Environment Protection Authority, South Australia, *Wind farms environmental noise guidelines*, July 2009.

A summary of noise limits for wind energy projects in other states is provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 – Current noise standards in Australia<sup>3</sup>**

State	Noise limit <sup>4</sup>
Victoria <sup>5</sup>	40 dB(A)
South Australia	Varies between 35 dB(A) and 40 dB(A) based on the locality
Western Australia	35 dB(A)
New South Wales	35 dB(A)
Queensland	37 dB(A) during the day, 35 dB(A) during the night

Note - There is some mixing of the LA90 and LAeq metrics. For wind farm noise the LAeq is about 1.5 dB(A) above the LA90. The preferential metric is LA90 because noise from a wind farm is fairly constant and the LAeq will generally be contaminated by other noise sources.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) noise guidelines<sup>6</sup> (2018) recommend a 45 dB (Lden)<sup>7</sup> limit for wind farm noise, measured outside the residence, to prevent negative effects on sleep and health. The report also noted the lack of research or evidence available to conclusively support the new guideline limit. Previous WHO guidelines were based on an inside measurement of 30 dB(A).

Australia's National Wind Farm Commissioner (NWFC) has recommended the development of consistent noise standards across all jurisdictions. Recommendation 5.2.8 from the NWFC's 2018 Annual Report (2019 report is yet to be released) states:

- *An appropriate level for a consistent noise limit would be 35 dB(A) LA90 10 min or background noise plus 5 dB(A), which ever is greater, measured outside of the residence.*
- *Applied penalties for specific noise conditions such as tonality and special audible characteristics should be set at 5 dB(A).*

This recommendation is likely based on the Independent Scientific Committee on Wind Turbines<sup>8</sup> which has suggested a wind turbine noise limit of 35 dB(A) (LA90, 10 min) to ensure minimal annoyance. This suggested limit equates to approximately 37 dB(A) LAeq 10 min or 43.4 dB(A) Lden.

Both the NWFC's and the Independent Scientific Committee on Wind Turbines recommended noise limit for wind turbines of 35 dB(A) (LA90, 10 min) have been established to minimise annoyance.

**Existing proposals noise guidelines**

Current proposals already in the assessment process include Robbins Island Renewable Energy Park (proponent UPC\AC Renewables) and Western Plains and St Patricks Plains wind farms (proponent Epuron).

<sup>3</sup> Office of the National Wind Farm Commissioner, *Annual Report to the Parliament of Australia, 31 March 2019*, S5.1 State noise standards measured outside the residence.

<sup>4</sup> Noise measurements of A-weighted sound pressure level are generally taken on the basis of LA90, 10 min. All States have a noise limit based on a fixed level or background noise plus 5 dB(A) whichever is the greater amount.

<sup>5</sup> Based on New Zealand standard NZS 6808:2010. Measurements of A-weighted sound pressure level are generally taken on the basis of LA90, 10 min.

<sup>6</sup> World Health Organisation, 2018, *Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region*.

<sup>7</sup> Day-evening-night level. It is a descriptor of noise level based on energy equivalent noise level (Leq) over a whole day with a penalty of 10 dB(A) for nighttime noise (23.00-7.00) and an additional penalty of 5 dB(A) for evening noise (i.e. 19.00-23.00).

<sup>8</sup> Established in 2015 by the then Minister for the Environment, the Committee provides an annual report to the Australian Parliament.

The Robbins Island Renewable Energy Park Project Specific Guidelines did not state a noise limit for the wind farms.

Western Plains Project Specific Guidelines (PSGs) state that the - *Noise assessment is to be carried out following contemporary procedures which is generally consistent with NZS6808 Standards. However, it should be noted that noise limit criteria will be established by the EPA. The proponent should have regard to the national and state noise limit standards and guidelines.*

A draft DPEMP has been submitted for the Western Plains Wind Farm which included a noise assessment report (July 2018). This report indicated that the highest predicted noise level at the closest resident which was not an involved receiver (landowner agreement) was 34.8 dB LA90.

The St Patricks Plains Wind Farm PSGs did not state a noise limit. A preliminary noise assessment prepared (in July 2019) for St Patricks Plains Wind Farm indicated that one receiver (not an involved receiver) would have a predicted noise level over 35 dBA (37.5 dB LA90) based on the layout at the time.

**PRESENT SITUATION**

In view of the NWFC’s and the Independent Scientific Committee on Wind Turbines recommendations, and in line with most other states, EPA Tasmania is proposing to introduce a noise limit of 35 dB(A) (LA90, 10 min) or background + 5 dB(A), whichever is the greater, for all new wind energy projects requiring approval under the EMPC Act, with the 5 dB(A) reduction from 40 dB(A) intended to ensure minimal annoyance at the closest sensitive receptor.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation was undertaken with the EPA Noise Specialist.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

The reduction in noise limits for wind energy projects may provide individuals and communities in the vicinity of wind turbines greater assurance that noise emissions from proposals would result in minimal noise nuisance to sensitive receivers in close proximity.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no perceived financial implications.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Board approve the use of the new noise limit criteria of 35 dB(A) (LA90, 10 min) or background + 5 dB(A), whichever is the greater, for all new wind energy projects.

Helen Mulligan

**MANAGER ASSESSMENTS**

**Approved: 27<sup>th</sup> July 2020**

Darryl Cook

**A/DEPUTY DIRECTOR, EPA TASMANIA**

**Approved for submission to the Board on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2020**

## Board of Environment Protection Authority



# Minutes

---

**Meeting No.:** 140  
**Date:** Tuesday, 4 August 2020 at 11:30 am  
**Location:** Level 4 Meeting Room No. 4.03 (Cradle), Lands Building,  
134 Macquarie Street, Hobart

### PRESENT

**Board** Mr Warren Jones (Chairperson)  
Mr Tony Ferrier (Member)  
Ms Belinda Hazell (Member)  
Prof. Colin Buxton (Member)  
Wes Ford (Director, EPA)

**Other attendees** Mr Darryl Cook (Deputy Director, EPA)  
Ms Helen Mulligan (Manager, Assessments)  
Ms Edith O'Shea (Environmental Officer, Assessments)  
Mr Greg Dowson (Water Specialist)

**Minute Taker** Mr Michael Gay (Executive Support, EPA Board)

---

### 140.1 Apologies

There were no apologies for the 140<sup>th</sup> EPA Board meeting.

OOS

OOS

## 140.5 Actions Arising

### a. Wind Energy Projects – Noise Limits

The Board agreed with the proposed new noise limit criteria. The Board queried how the St Patrick's Plains wind farm proposal and existing wind farms will be dealt with. EPA Tasmania stated that it was not intended to impose the new criteria on existing wind farms, noting that all but one existing wind farm meets the 35 dB(A) criteria already.

EPA Tasmania noted that the St Patrick's Plains proposal was still in a relatively early stage and has not been publicly advertised yet. It was also noted that final turbine locations have not yet been locked in.

The Board resolved to:

- Note that it had discussed the St Patrick's Plains wind farm proposal and determined that it was at a stage where it was reasonable to require them to meet the new noise limit criteria;
- Request the Director to write to the Proponent to vary their Guidelines to include the new noise limit criteria; and
- Approve the use of the new noise limit criteria of 35 dB(A) (LA90, 10 min) or background +5 dB(A), whichever is the greater, for all new wind energy projects.

OOS

## Environment Protection Authority

**EPA Board Communiqué****August 2020****Regular Meeting 140, Tuesday 4 August**

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

**Waste levy**

Noting that it remains work in progress, the Board reviewed a draft paper *Principles for Waste Governance and Levy in Tasmania* which was provided for discussion and feedback. The Board noted that it should be a priority to direct funds raised into developing projects for the diversion of waste and the portion devoted to administration kept to a minimum.

**Environment Protection Fund**

The Board received and noted an update on the balance of the Environment Protection Fund and that \$74,420 grant for eagle research will be transferred soon.

**Noise limits for wind energy projects**

A proposal to set a new noise limit for future wind energy projects was put to the Board in March. The Board requested further clarification on how the proposed new limit would apply to projects currently in the assessment process, which was provided to this meeting.

The Board discussed and agreed to adopt as policy the proposed lower noise limit of 35 dB(A) at residences or land zoned for sensitive uses for new wind energy projects. This level is becoming the accepted standard elsewhere in Australia. The previous criterion for Tasmania was 40 dB(A), based on a New Zealand standard. The 35dB(A) criterion, or background + 5 dB(A), will now be Board policy for the assessment of new wind farm proposals. The Board agreed that the St Patricks Plains wind farm proposal was still in the early development stages and there should be adequate flexibility regarding turbine location to comply with this new limit. The Board requested the Director inform the proponents of the St Patricks Plains development of the new policy limit.

**Standard provision of data to the public**

The Board noted the *Discretionary Information Disclosure Policy* and Background Paper provided for discussion. The Board discussed the type of information that may be put on the EPA website for public access and how to balance the effort and cost of putting material on the web against the likely demand for some information. The Board noted that information that is unlikely to be of general interest can be made available on request.

**Site visits**

The Board agreed to make visits to the sites of two proposals coming up for assessment decisions; the Ten Mile Enterprise proposed pig processing facility (abattoir) and the Conhur composting facility; in the last week of August 2020.

**Assessment – Huon Aquaculture Group Pty Ltd – Fish Processing Facility, Parramatta Creek – Production Increase**

Huon Aquaculture Group (HAG) applied to increase the production limit for its Paramatta Creek processing factory. This was partly to formalise an unauthorised exceedance of the limit set by the pre-existing permit and partly to allow for future growth.

The major environmental issue considered by the Board was the management of wastewater. This has been an ongoing issue at Paramatta Creek where the irrigation of wastewater has led to groundwater and surface water contamination and soil degradation. HAG has negotiated access to an adjoining property to expand the area available for irrigation and contracted expert consultants to prepare a sustainable irrigation plan. A new winter storage dam for treated wastewater is proposed. The Board discussed:

- potential overflow from the winter storage dam and the likely consequences
- the need for a contingency management plan

- frequency of compliance checks and monitoring
- effects of salt in the wastewater and whether the use of refrigerated tankers is practical to reduce the salt load.

The Board considered a number of comments on the draft conditions by HAG and requested several changes to the draft conditions arising from the discussion. The Board approved the application subject to a range of conditions to ensure that the activity becomes more environmentally sustainable.

#### **Technical Guidance for Water Quality Objectives setting for Tasmania**

The Board has a number of responsibilities under the State Policy on Water Quality Management including setting or approving water quality objectives. EPA Tasmania provided a presentation on the *Technical Guidance for Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) Setting for Tasmania*. The Board noted the significant effort put in by EPA Tasmania's Water Section in developing the framework and Guidance document. The Board resolved to approve the document for use in setting water quality objectives incorporated into environmental assessments and its publication on the EPA website for public use.

#### **Special Fee Remissions**

The Board considered several applications for Special Fee Remissions and agreed to provide a partial remission to the Cornwall Coal Company Ltd, as a result of a rationalisation of its permits.

RTI - DL - RELEASE - EPA

# EPA Board Policy

## Noise limits for wind energy projects



### Application

This policy is adopted by the Board of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA Board) for the purpose of assessing wind energy projects and requiring conditions or restrictions in respect to wind farm noise under the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994* (EMPCA).

This policy supersedes any previous policy of the EPA Board in respect to noise criteria for wind energy projects.

This policy applies from **31 July 2025** and will apply to all wind energy projects currently under assessment. It remains in place until revoked.

### Technical terms

$L_{Aeq}$  means the A-weighted equivalent continuous sound level.

$L_{A90}$  means the A-weighted sound level that is exceeded for 90% of the measurement period.

**dB** means decibel.

**dB(A)** means decibel when stating A-weighted sound pressure level.

### Design Criteria

**The predicted equivalent noise level at any noise sensitive premises should not exceed the greater of:**

- a) **35 dB(A)  $L_{Aeq}$ , 10 min; or**
- b) **Background ( $L_{A90}$ ) + 5 dB(A).**

This design criteria applies to all noise emissions from the activity, inclusive of wind turbines and all ancillary infrastructure. It has been set for the protection of sensitive receivers during periods of low background noise.

The background noise for day, evening and night-time must be calculated separately to determine the applicable (lowest) background level, and is not to be averaged across a 24-hour period.

For predictive purposes, a difference of ~2 dB between measured  $L_{A90}$ , 10 min levels and  $L_{Aeq}$ , 10 min emissions from the activity must be noted. The predicted noise levels should be adjusted for special audio characteristics and/or the applicable adjustment factors must be discussed.

The EPA South Australia *Wind farms environmental noise guidelines 2021* (or the most recent revised version of that document) is to be used for assessing whether a wind farm can meet this design criteria, except where that guideline may be inconsistent with this policy.

### Noise Measurements

If approved, wind energy projects will contain conditions and restrictions to enforce the design criteria. The following guidance is provided for the interpretation of EPA Board wind energy project noise requirements:

1. It is generally acceptable for wind turbine noise to be measured in  $L_{A90}$ , but note that alternative techniques may be required (including measuring in  $L_{Aeq}$ ) to better detect special audible characteristics (dominant and intrusive characteristics) and noise fluctuations or intermittent noise.
2. An appropriate conversion factor must be added to the measured  $L_{A90}$  level to derive the representative  $L_{Aeq}$  noise level. To be representative of  $L_{Aeq}$ , generally applying +2 dB(A) conversion factor to the measured  $L_{A90}$  level is acceptable.

# Noise limits for wind energy projects

3. Where special audible characteristics (dominant and intrusive characteristics) are detected from any wind farm noise, a correction factor must be applied in accordance with the *Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual*.
4. The EPA South Australia *Wind farms environmental noise guidelines 2021* (or the most recent revised version of that document) is to be used for all wind farm noise measurements, except where that guideline may be inconsistent with this policy.

Date

Signed:

Andrew Paul  
Chairperson  
Board Of The Environment Protection Authority

RTI - DL - RELEASE - EPA

## Draft new standard condition for wind energy projects

### Definitions:

$L_{Aeq}$  means the A-weighted equivalent continuous sound level.

$L_{A90}$  means the A-weighted sound level that is exceeded for 90% of the measurement period.

**dB(A)** means decibel when stating A-weighted sound pressure level.

### N1 - Wind farm noise emission limits

1. Noise emissions from the activity at any noise sensitive premises must not exceed 35 dB(A)  $L_{Aeq, 10mins}$ .
2. Where the combined level of noise from the activity and the normal ambient noise exceeds the noise level stated above, this condition will not be considered to be breached unless the noise emissions from the activity are audible and exceed the background noise levels by at least 5 dB(A) at any noise sensitive premises.
3. The time interval over which noise levels are averaged must be 10 minutes.
4. Measured noise levels must be adjusted for special audio characteristics (dominant and intrusive characteristics) in accordance with the Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual.
5. Measured noise levels conducted in  $L_{A90}$  must be adjusted to be representative of the  $L_{Aeq}$  limit.
6. Commissioning noise measurements must include on/off testing to assess for any special audio characteristics (dominant and intrusive characteristics).

Proponent name	Proposal name	Location	Type of assessment	Commonwealth matters	Lead Assessment Officer	Supporting Assessment Officer/s	Principal Assessment Officer	Status of assessment	Date EPA Board final guidance issued or due to be issued	Links to relevant documents	Links to relevant documents	MyDAS file
CELLARS HILL WIND FARM PTY LTD	CELLARS HILL WIND FARM MAJOR PROJECT	10 KM NW OF BOTHWELL , BOTHWELL TAS 7030	Major Project under LUPAA	Development Assessment Panel (DAP) assessing MNES under EPBC Act through one-off accreditation	Liz Richardson	Alan Davidson	Cath Browning	Indicative guidance issued by the EPA Board on 11/3/2025; Awaiting publication of draft assessment criteria by DAP; final EPA Board guidance to be issued after draft assessment criteria published.	Not applicable - final guidance yet to be issued and statutory deadline for issuing not yet known as depends on date of publication of draft assessment criteria by DAP	<a href="#">Assessment Requirement Notice (ARN) including EPA Board's indicative guidance</a>		<a href="#">24/5114</a>
ACEN NORTH EAST TASMANIA PTY LTD	NORTH EAST WIND DEVELOPMENT MAJOR PROJECT	RUSHY LAGOON AND WATERHOUSE TAS 7264	Major Project under LUPAA	Separate EPBC Act assessment process	Cath Browning	Ella Jackson	Cath Browning	Indicative guidance issued by the EPA Board on 14/09/2022; Final guidance issued by EPA Board on 24/07/2023; Awaiting Major Project Impact Statement (MPIS); MPIS is due on 25/08/2026.	24/07/2023	<a href="#">EPA Board's final guidance with administrative error corrected</a>	<a href="#">EPA representation on draft assessment criteria</a>	<a href="#">22/7009</a>
HELLYER WIND FARM PTY LTD THE TRUSTEE FOR EQUIS WIND (AUSTRALIA) PROJECTS (LHWF2) HOLDING TRUST trading as Equis Wind (Australia) Projects (LHWF2) Pty Ltd	HELLYER WIND FARM	2753 RIDGLEY HWY, HAMPSHIRE TAS 7321	Level 2 activity, s 25 of EMPCA, Class 2C	Bilateral agreement applies; EPA Board assessing MNES	Charlotte Atkin	N/A	Cath Browning	EIS Guidelines issued on 28/11/2022; Awaiting EIS; EIS is due on 30/06/2026	28/11/2022	<a href="#">EIS Guidelines</a>		<a href="#">22/5680</a>
	BELL BAY WIND FARM MAJOR PROJECT	GEORGE TOWN, BEECHFORD , LOW HEAD TAS 7253	Major Project under LUPAA	Separate EPBC Act assessment process	Charlotte Atkin	Michael Gay	Cath Browning	Indicative guidance issued by the EPA Board on 10/09/2024; Final guidance issued by EPA Board on 15/11/2024; Awaiting Major Project Impact Statement (MPIS); MPIS is due on 04/12/2025.	15/11/2024	<a href="#">EPA Board's final guidance</a>	<a href="#">EPA representation on draft assessment criteria</a>	<a href="#">24/3229</a>
BASHAN WIND FARM PTY LTD	BASAN WIND FARM	CENTRAL HIGHLANDS TAS 7140	Level 2 activity, s 25 of EMPCA, Class 2C	Bilateral agreement applies; EPA Board assessing MNES	Jacqui Allan	Liz Richardson	Mary Gibbs	EIS Guidelines issued on 29/04/2025; Awaiting EIS; EIS is due on 29/04/2026	29/04/2025	<a href="#">EIS Guidelines</a>		<a href="#">23/8844</a>
GUILDFORD WIND FARM PTY LTD	GUILDFORD WIND FARM	GUILDFORD RD, NORTH WEST TASMANIA TAS 7321	Level 2 activity, s 25 of EMPCA, Class 2C	Bilateral agreement applies; EPA Board assessing MNES	Lauryn Kitchener	N/A	Edith O'Shea	EIS Guidelines issued on 03/12/2020; Awaiting EIS; EIS is due on 31/12/2026	3/12/2020	<a href="#">EIS Guidelines</a>		<a href="#">EN-EM-EV-DE-262122-001</a>
WOOLNORTH WIND FARM HOLDING PTY LTD	WOOLNORTH WIND FARM REPOWERING	STUDLAND BAY AND BLUFF POINT, 1277 & 1681 WOOLNORTH RD, WOOLNORTH TAS 7330	Level 2 activity, s 25 of EMPCA, Class 2C	Bilateral agreement applies; EPA Board assessing MNES	Liz Richardson	Natalie Holman	Cath Browning	Draft EIS Guidelines advertised for public comment 16/11/24 to 2/12/24; Final EIS Guidelines expected to be issued in May 2025; Statutory clock is stopped on issuing final EIS Guidelines while awaiting DCCEEW comments	Not applicable - final EIS Guidelines yet to be issued and statutory clock is stopped	<a href="#">Draft EIS Guidelines that went to advertising</a>	<a href="#">Final EIS Guidelines awaiting finalisation and DCCEEW comments</a>	<a href="#">24/2946</a>
WESTCOAST RENEWABLE ENERGY PTY LTD	WHALEBACK RIDGE RENEWABLE ENERGY MAJOR PROJECT	WEST COAST REGION , WEST COAST TAS 7469	Major Project under LUPAA	Separate EPBC Act assessment process	Ella Jackson	N/A	Cath Browning	Indicative guidance issued by the EPA Board on 11/04/2024; Final guidance issued by EPA Board on 05/08/2024; Awaiting Major Project Impact Statement (MPIS); MPIS is due on 27/08/2026.	5/08/2024	<a href="#">EPA Board's final guidance</a>	<a href="#">EPA representation on draft assessment criteria</a>	<a href="#">24/704</a>
FERA AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	TRIABUNNA WIND FARM	TRIABUNNA, TAS, 7190	EPA Director likely to require referral under s 24 of EMPCA	Declared a controlled action under EPBC Act but assessment approach (i.e. whether bilateral agreement applies) not yet determined	Lauryn Kitchener	N/A	Edith O'Shea	Proposal not yet formally 'called-in' by EPA Director as this cannot occur until DA lodged with Council; Indicative guidance issued by the EPA Board on 14/07/2023	Not applicable	<a href="#">EPA Board's indicative guidance</a>		<a href="#">21/3377</a>