

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
Eagles				
Wedge-tailed eagles				
2,16,21,29,95,183,190,194,197,198,244,279,296,307,317,320,323,332,334,346,37033,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,95,96,98,100,101,103,104,105,106,107,109,110,112,114,116,121,122,126,127,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,145,146,147,148,149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202,203,205,206,209,210,211,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	241	Increased risk to Wedge-tailed eagles from potential collision with Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs). For example, concerns raised included: Eagle species at Robbins Island were observed flying within the rotor swept area (between 30 m and 270 m) There is little scope for resident wedge-tailed eagles to change nesting sites and their main foraging sites, as the proposal covers 84% of island.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
56, 242, 259,277, 287,	6	Impact to WTE and potential impact to WTE nests in close proximity to WTGs	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
95,165,183,201, 204, 238, 248,251,277,284,287,290,317,320,323,332,346,370,37633,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,95,96,98,100,101,103,104,105,106,107,109,110,112,114,116,121,122,126,127,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,145,146,147,148,149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202,203,205,206,209,210,211,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	239	Buffer zone of 1 km considered insufficient for species protection. Concerns raised included: The DPEMP lacks assessment demonstrating that the buffer zone mitigates potential impacts. Robbins Island is a significant hunting, feeding and nesting zone for raptors. Buffer zones should be larger, with reference to Murgatroyd research.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
243,251	2	A 1 km buffer has no basis for collision risk reduction. GPS tracking should be used for establishing data-based assignment for buffers in different landscapes. Use of automated WTG curtailment for reducing collision with WTGs is encouraging.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
183,197,198,251,376,317,320,323,332,346	10	Curtailment technology based mitigation measures are considered insufficient and unproven in Tasmania. The DPEMP does not provide evidence demonstrating that curtailment technology is effective. The DPEMP does not provide information about success of technology from other Tasmanian windfarms (using different systems). The benefits claimed of the system proposed are based on a single study from the USA and are not representative. The DPEMP does not commit to automated detection and WTG curtailment.	no	Covered in the preliminary Eagle Monitoring and Management Plan (EMMP). To be addressed in the final EMMP prior to construction. The EMMP will be required by permit condition if the project is approved.
197, 323	2	The DPEMP does not provide evidence demonstrating that painting a blade black is effective, and effectiveness of the measure is unproven.	no	Covered in the preliminary EMMP.
243	1	Representor has concerns with assessment methods being outdated and inadequate. A moratorium on windfarm approvals should be imposed until the Threatened Tasmanian Eagle Recovery Plan is updated and publicly available. Strategic planning for siting of large developments and impacts to threatened species (i.e. WTEs) should be undertaken. WTE densities across the landscape should be a requirement for proponents to demonstrate a low impact site. Bird utilisation survey methods are inadequate. Representor questions the accuracy in determining the number of WTEs on Robbins based on utilisation data. Eagle nest data is outdated with the last eagle survey undertaken in July 2018.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP and the preliminary EMMP. Updated surveys will be required prior to construction and the final design, and will be required by a permit condition if approved.
243	1	October 2018 activity checks should have been undertaken by air, not ground based checks. Deployment of cameras at some eagle nests is concerning as is the lack of detail on the purpose of camera installation.	no	Updated surveys will be required prior to construction and prior to the final design. This will be required by a permit condition if approved.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
243	1	Offsets Attempts to count and monitor population trends of eagles should be a requirement of developments to properly assess impacts. Likewise a population viability assessment should be undertaken. A direct offset for eagles should consider making power lines and poles 'bird safe' since collision with powerlines and electrocution on poles is the most common known anthropogenic cause of WTE death in Tasmania.	no	To be addressed in the EMMP prior to construction, this will be required as a permit condition if approved.
277, 346	2	The proposed use of offsets is not adequate, as it does not equal or exceed potential impacts. For example, if funds are directed to offset programs they should be used to create and manage covenants, and commitments should include prescriptions for how nest sites are chosen and managed.	no	Offsets will be outlined in the EMMP as required by a permit condition if approved.
243	1	No useful assessment in the DPMP on possible impact on the population of WTE or WBSE, with no cumulative impact assessment. It seems likely that windfarms may create population sinks. More tagged eagles on and adjacent to windfarms may be able to measure this.	no	Proponent to note.
317,320,332,248	4	Noise from construction and operation will negatively impact wedge-tailed eagles. For example, due to blasting, pile driving, heavy vehicles and industrial lighting.	no	To be addressed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) prior to construction, these will be required by permit conditions if approved.
271	1	Unacceptable risk to the WTE - The wind farm of the scale and specifications proposed will cause significant eagle mortality. There is no commitment by the proponent to install technology to mitigate eagle mortality. The development poses unacceptable risk to the population of WTE.	no	Proponent has committed to install an automated detection and curtailment system and this will be required by permit conditions if approved.
189, 194,277,290	4	The DPMP does not evaluate cumulative impacts of windfarms on Wedge-tailed eagles and White-bellied sea eagles at nearby windfarms.	no	Proponent to note.
189,346	2	Mitigation measure to remove macropod carcasses over 200 m from turbines are inadequate. For example: Depositing carcasses will attract individual eagles to vicinity, placing them at risk, particularly when distracted by aggressive behaviour of territorial eagles. It is not a practical management measure, as it is very labour intensive and expensive.	no	Macropod carcass management will be addressed in the EMMP, this will be required by permit condition if approved.
277,320	2	The Tasmanian Eagle Recovery Plan 2006-2010 is outdated, however DPMP does not demonstrate that the proposal will meet the recovery objectives.	no	Proponent to note.
290	1	Mortality monitoring inadequate	no	Mortality monitoring will be further defined in the final EMMP, this will be required by permit condition if approved.
290	1	Out of date nesting data	no	Updated surveys will be required prior to construction and will be required by a permit condition if approved.
290	1	No qualitative data on eagle flight heights.	no	Proponent to note.
346	1	Commitments 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,11,12,13,16 rely on reports produced after approval. Threatened status of eagles requires prescriptive actions before approval.	no	Proponent to note.
251	1	No discussion in DPMP about the disturbance to bird life during construction stage, with 66 months of construction. Migratory birds may be disturbed and cause them to lose weight and not be able to make the distance of their migration. Impact on shy albatross population from turbine collision.	no	Potential impacts on birds considered in S6.3 of the DPMP.
52,185,317,327	4	26.4.2 - Impact on birds (WTE, WBSE, migratory birds) though collision with WTGs White-bellied sea eagles	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPMP

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
95,145,194,197,198,317,334,27933,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	228	Increased risk to white-bellied sea eagles from potential collision with WTGs.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
197,198,317,25133,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	224	Potential disturbance to WBSE nest in proximity to bridge through traffic movements.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
16,56,242	3	Impacts to white-bellied sea eagle population	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
346	1	Buffer zone of 1 km considered insufficient for species protection. The DPEMP lacks assessment demonstrating that the buffer zone mitigates potential impacts.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
Threatened avian fauna				
Orange-bellied parrot (OBP)				
21,176,183,197,198,323,332,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	228	Clearance of native vegetation which forms potential habitat for Orange-bellied Parrot (OBP).	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
189	1	Power lines and other associated infrastructure have the potential to kill many species, including the OBP.	no	Proponent to note.
197,198	2	Financial contribution for OBP mentioned in the DPEMP has not been discussed with the Cradle Coast Authority.	no	Offsets to be further developed in final OBP Monitoring and Management Plan prior to construction, this will be required by permit conditions if approved.
204	1	OBP is a common user of the Robbins Island ecosystem.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
221	1	Robbins Island sits within the OBPs migratory corridor and has the potential to impact the entire population. The principal of avoiding sites of high importance to avoid impact has not been applied to this proposal. Surveys were inadequate and outdated. Proposal has understated the values of pasture and weed species to the OBP. The proposal lacks information of flight behaviour (flight height, direction, frequency) and hence level of collision risk cannot be determined. The loss of one OBP is considered a significant loss. High level of uncertainty about the use of the island and flight behaviour on migration, therefore the project should not proceed. Offset package is ill-conceived and inadequate. Dead bird searched methodology inadequate to ascertain impact to small birds.	yes	Further information has been requested from the proponent as part of the supplementary information.
250	1	Representor concerned of the unacceptable risk to the survival of the OBP. There has not been sufficient effort to understand the use of Robbins Island by migrating OBPS and the risk to the species. There is a high level of uncertainty on the potential for OBPs to collide with WTGs and to be adversely affect their behaviour leading to decrease in survival rates.	yes	Further information has been requested from the proponent as part of the supplementary information.
259	1	Concern about potential negative impacts on OBPs	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
267	1	Representor considers - No increase in mortality is acceptable for the OBP, given it is critically endangered and any mortality undermines existing conservation efforts. The entire wild population passes through the area twice per year, but the flight corridor and behaviour is unknown. Robbins Island contains key foraging habitat resources within the species known migration range. All habitat is critical for survival regardless of when the location was last occupied by the wild population. Flight behaviour has not been specifically examined or accurately measured, and hence whether OBPs will be impacted through collision or changed behaviour resulting in avoidance is unknown and cannot currently be determined. The uncertainty is high. Given the high level of uncertainty the windfarm should not proceed at this stage. The impact to the OBP will be significant.	yes	Further information has been requested from the proponent as part of the supplementary information.
271	1	The DA fails to adequately articulate the risk posed by the WTGs to the OBP. The development poses an unacceptable risk to the species and should not proceed.	yes	Further information has been requested from the proponent as part of the supplementary information.
272,290	2	The area is critical to OBP migration	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
346	1	DPEMP lacks assessment to demonstrate that the exclusion zones mitigate potential impacts to OBP	no	Proponent to note.
346	1	Commitment 11 requires delay in timing of installation of turbines 3,4,6 and 2 to do studies, but no commitment for removal of turbines is proposed if studies find a high risk of OBP using areas. Study proposed (funded through offset payments) described as broad study of "OBP tracking in the Tasmanian migration range", not intended to inform management of Robbins Island, or address questions about 3,4,6 and 2. No analysis to demonstrate that \$50,000 for offset payment is sufficient to provide results. Offset payment would be better directed to a Robbins Island specific study to track OBPs and shorebird species, and could be used to inform redesign of windfarm.	no	Further information has been requested from the proponent as part of the supplementary information. Offsets to be finalised in the OBP MMP prior to construction, this will be required by a permit condition if approved.
279	1	Risk of collision with WTGs	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
287	1	OBP offset is not an appropriate measure.	no	Proponent to note.
290	1	A loss of a single bird will have a significant impact on the population. All suitable habitat in the migratory path should be protected. The wind farm may act as a barrier to migration, changing the behaviours of migrating birds as well as collisions.	no	Proponent to note.
Masked Owl				
323	1	Methodology inadequate and underestimates presence of Masked Owls. Report does not consider that Masked Owls are known to nest in wet forests.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
Swift parrot				

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
176,183,197,198,317,323,33233,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	227	Clearance of native vegetation which forms potential habitat for Swift parrot.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
242	1	Impact to swift parrot	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
279	279	Risk of collision with WTGs	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
Grey goshawk				
197,198,201,323,25133,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	225	Impact/removal of grey goshawk nest	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
317,323	2	No follow up survey of Grey goshawk nest two years after it was reported unoccupied, could be being used.	no	An updated survey will be required prior to construction and will be required by permit condition if approved.
Migratory shorebirds				
1,2,5,12,13,16,20,21,27,30,56,111,123,144,95,171,176,183,194,196,201, 208,232,242, 244,220, 247,263,275,279,284,287,288,289,296,298,307,317,323,327,332,334,370,377,38133,34,35,36,37, 38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	265	Robbins Island and adjacent areas (Boullanger Bay and Robbins Passage) are a major shorebird refuge. The area supports internationally and nationally significant numbers of resident and migratory shorebirds. These areas are significantly threatened by construction, development and operation of WTGs and associated infrastructure. Mitigation measures proposed are not considered sufficient. Concerns raised included: - Collision risk of migratory shorebirds with WTGs. - Impacts to the behaviour (including roosting) and movements of birds through turbines and associated habitat destruction and collision risk associated with WTG locations. - Collision risk of shorebirds with turbines when crossing Robbins Island between feeding and roosting sites, as well as during pre-migration flights. - Disturbance to shorebird refuge sites from increase in site access, particularly during construction. - Impact to Eastern curlew, great knot, curlew sandpiper, OBP, greater sand plover, white-throated needle-tail.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
16,27,296	3	Noise disturbance to migratory shorebirds during quarrying and construction	no	To be addressed in the final Quarry Management Plan (QMP) and Shorebird Monitoring and Management Plan (SMMP). To be required by permit conditions if approved.
201, 317,323	3	Robbins Passage - Boullanger Bay is an important area. Numbers of shorebird represent significant percentage of populations and it is critical to manage the area as an integrated system.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
1,204	2	The location is of international significance as a wetland for migratory and resident shorebirds, which roost, feed and nest in the area. Dust emissions is a significant issue for bird health. Noise impacts from WTG operations on birds.	no	Dust emissions to be addressed in the final QMP and CEMP as required by permit conditions if approved. Noise impacts to be addressed in the OEMP.
232,269, 259, 238,248	5	Collision risk of shorebirds with turbines when crossing Robbins Island between feeding and roosting sites as well as during pre-migration flights, including Latham's Snipe, Pacific Gull (not listed) with breeding colony on Howie Island and pelicans.	no	Proponent to note.
232	1	Further studies are needed for each shorebird species, including tracking.	no	Proponent to note.
270	1	The Robbins Island- Boullanger Bay wetlands are internationally important, with significant numbers of threatened and migratory shorebird species. Key concerns - mortality of birds colliding with WTGs, changes in behaviour from installation of WTGs, including feeding and breeding behaviour. The conclusion of the 2011 tracking study (Rogers et al - App G) that there will be limited impact is not adequately supported. It is inevitable that migratory species will fly across the land to access feeding resources. The wind farm represents a significant threat which will seriously impact populations of shorebirds.	no	Proponent to comment.
27	1	Removal of sand for wharf will impact bird habitat	no	To be addressed in the final QMP as required by permit conditions if approved.
1,5,13,16,27,29,95,194,317,323,	11	DPMP does not include key information about each shorebird species, for example: - impact on flight path of migratory shorebirds (including Eastern curlew, curlew sandpaper, great knot) - information about flight path of migratory shorebirds during night time or inland areas during bad weather - cumulative frequency of fatalities is not provided.	no	Proponent to note.
232	1	Inaccurate survey counts of shorebirds, therefore evaluation of shorebird information is flawed.	no	Proponent to note.
232	1	Further studies are needed for each shorebird species, including tracking.	no	Proponent to note.
176	1	Concern about impacts to ecosystem if birds are impacted by the proposal.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPMP.
189	1	Robbins island is not an acceptable location for a windfarm in relation to impacts to avifauna. International studies on bird strike recognise that windfarms should not be located on the coast, wetlands or the flight path of migrant birds. Consultants have not adequately addressed impacts.	no	Proponent to note.
189	1	Shorebird Telemetry and Behaviour Reports (Appendices G and I) were inadequate. - Limited in species selection, seasonal coverage and methodology - More holistic radar monitoring should have been used, more comprehensive and would detect flocks of all species. - More intensive field work on multiple species should have been used. - Telemetry limited to Red-necked Stints and Ruddy Turnstones, and was not representative - Only 42 birds studied of the 6000+ migratory species that use the area. - Sites of bird capture were biased (captured on western side of island) - Report did not address several endangered species - Report did not address pasture feeding of some species.	no	Proponent to note.
189,323	2	General Bird Behaviour descriptions (Appendices G and I) inadequate, Report fails to address significance of threatened and declining species utilising the area. Keeping windfarms away from feeding and roosting hotspot areas like Robbins Passage is an important part of the Australian commitment (Bonn Convention and other agreements) towards preventing extinction of species.	no	Surveys undertaken in accordance with Project Specific Guidelines (PSGs). Proponent to note.
346	1	Lacks assessment to demonstrate that the exclusion zones mitigate potential impacts.	no	Proponent to note
346	1	Radio tracking had critical limitations - Only two species tracked. Some limited evidence presented in Appendix G of shorebirds crossing the island, which should have prompted further studies. Evidence that species travelled across land to Mosquito inlet should have prompted further studies. Unclear how boundary of proposed WTG exclusion zone in NW Robbins Island was determined.	no	Proponent to note.
346	1	Automated turbine shutdown system should be committed to be used for shorebirds.	no	Proponent to note.
284	1	Impact to migratory species through noise, flicker, marine traffic, increased pollution, visual changes to habitat.	no	To be addressed in the SMMP prior to construction, this will be required by a permit condition if approved.
287	1	Impacts from spread of rice grass, light pollution and noise (from bridge and wharf) on shorebirds	no	To be addressed in the SMMP prior to construction, this will be required by a permit condition if approved.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
290	1	<p>The DPEMP is fundamentally flawed - It fails to accept the Precautionary Principle, dismissing the importance of potential deaths of critically endangered species, because "they are not present in large numbers".</p> <p>It proposes the industrialisation of farm and native vegetation amid the state's largest wild and natural wetland.</p> <p>It overlooks the Boullanger Bay-Robbins Passage wetland habitat of the southern-most internationally significant area of migratory shorebirds in the entire East Asian-Australasian Flyaway.</p> <p>Bird surveys for shorebirds were inadequate - limited to brief periods, poorly timed, patchy and out of date.</p> <p>The main departure period of migratory shorebirds was poorly documented.</p> <p>Climb rates were significantly overestimated for migratory shorebirds, assuming a climb rate of up to 1.5 m/second, and inappropriately applying this value for all species.</p> <p>Based on published climb rates and the use of tail winds to initiate their migration, shorebirds departing are at risk of collision with WTGs.</p> <p>Deeply flawed radio-tracking survey, with the radio antenna array not set up to detect birds actually flying over most of the island, with 80% of White Rock Ridge not covered. Inappropriate to extrapolate the limited results from two species to more than 20 different shorebird species.</p> <p>Flight heights at start of migration not adequately assessed.</p> <p>Overlooks the likelihood that predominant wind directions will carry birds departing on migratory flights into the WTG areas, sited in some cases, just 2 km for key coastal roost sites.</p> <p>The large volume of turbulent airflow over and downstream of Robbins Island produced by the WTGs will have potential adverse impacts for departing shorebirds, likely reducing their climb rates and increasing their risk of collision.</p> <p>Mortality monitoring is inadequate.</p> <p>Lighting of infrastructure (bridge and wharf) will pose risk of collision for shorebirds and seabirds and potentially cause changes in foraging behaviour.</p> <p>Collision with meteorological masts.</p> <p>Impacts from marine noise on diving seabirds.</p>	no	Proponent to comment.
290	1	High risk to white-throated needletail through WTG collisions with impact to the species not adequately addressed.	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP
Resident shorebirds				
29,21,56,152,95,186,197,198,376,283, 232, 33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	232	<p>Robbins Island and adjacent areas (Boullanger Bay and Robbins Passage) are a major shorebird refuge. The area supports internationally and nationally significant numbers of resident shorebirds. These areas are significantly threatened by construction, development and operation of wind turbines and associated infrastructure. Mitigation measures proposed are not considered sufficient.</p> <p>Concerns raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collision risk of resident shorebirds with turbines - Impacts to the behaviour and movements of birds through distribution of turbines, and associated habitat destruction and collision risk - Collision risk of shorebirds with turbines when crossing Robbins Island between feeding and roosting sites as well as during pre-migration flights. - Disturbance to shorebird refuge sites from increase in site access, particularly during construction. - Further studies are needed for each shorebird species, including tracking. 	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP and the preliminary Shorebird Monitoring and Management Plan (SMMP).
29,	2	Wharf construction will destroy hooded plover nesting sites	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP and the preliminary SMMP.
197,198	2	Short-tailed shearwaters	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP.
General birdlife				
27,	2	Impacts on black swans and pelicans	no	Proponent to note.
152, 201	2	The area is internationally important and the infrastructure will impact the entire range of species found in the area.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP
263	1	The Bird Impact Assessment is incomplete as it does not cover the Remarkable Banks Area and its waterbodies. The survey procedure (p12) is inadequate and not representative of Remarkable Banks. Impact to waterbirds not adequately assessed.	no	Surveys undertaken in accordance with Project Specific Guidelines (PSGs). Proponent to note.
57,263,323	3	Impact of and mitigation of bird strike on met masts is not considered.	no	Covered in S6.3 of DPEMP. To be addressed in final monitoring and management plans.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
346	1	Key protection measures, including WTG exclusion zones and preliminary plans for eagles, shorebirds and OBPs recommended by assessments in the DPEMP are not included in the list of commitments at section 10. Commitment 2 in Preliminary Eagle Monitoring and Management Plan only refers to exclusion zones being applied to any new nests identified.	no	Proponent to note
57,285	2	Impact of lighting (bridge, wharf, nightwork construction) on birds (particularly shearwaters and shorebirds) is not considered.	no	Covered in S6.3 and Appendix N of DPEMP
Threatened non-avian fauna species				
Tasmanian devil				
95,176,190,197,198,310,317,332,334,283,1,21,27,51,94,201,370,377,5,29,95,194,307,327,376,28,3,16,52,296,204,238,242,248,284,285,287,288,289,271,27933,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,4,5,46,47,48,49,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,95,96,98,100,101,103,104,105,106,107,109,110,112,114,116,121,122,126,127,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,145,146,147,148,149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202,203,205,206,209,210,211,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	260	Potential impacts to Tasmanian Devils, including: Risk of spreading devil tumour facial disease to Robbins Island Increased roadkill risk from construction/ operation traffic Impact to devil dens Impact to denning and foraging habitat Noise impacts from construction and operation Robbins Island population should be considered critical to safeguarding the species.	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP. To be further detailed in the Design report and CEMP following micro-siting of WTGS and associated infrastructure as well as pre-clearance surveys for devil dens. The Design report and CEMP will be required by permit conditions, if approved.
27	1	Impact of fencing and roads on Devil movement and potential habitat fragmentation.	no	Proponent to note.
194,283,317,197,198,323,334	7	Reference to emails between federal officials and UPC that the company had not addressed potential offsets for devil habitats, and that that as devil colony on the island is unique offsets are unlikely to exist.	no	Tasmanian devils on Robbins Island are not considered a unique population.
197,198,283	3	Sampling for Tasmanian devils not sufficient. Concerns included: Survey for devil dens proposed inconsistent with DPIPWE survey guidelines. Searches proposed for one month before construction, however survey guidelines recommend that activities are minimised during denning period (July -September).	no	Surveys were undertaken in accordance with survey guidelines. Further surveys will be required prior to construction, with results required in the Design report and CEMP, required by permit conditions, if approved.
317	1	Proponent has not proposed restrictions to the hours (daylight hours) for vehicle movements on island, associated roadkill risk.	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP
332	1	40km/hr speed limit is too high, and how will it be enforced?	no	Speed limits and other mitigation measures will be required to be implemented through the CEMP.
283	1	Devil roadkill death information outdated and incorrect, current assessment required. Local group collected data (not provided) which found 106 roadkill deaths between 1/12/21-15/2/22	no	Roadkill management will be addressed in the Roadkill Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan (RMAMP) required as part of the CEMP.
283	1	Offset proposed for roadkill deaths does not cover impacts caused by devil facial tumour disease	no	Proponent to note.
201	1	Mapping of habitat is considered insufficient.	no	Habitat mapping is considered sufficient and is covered in S6.2.
201, 238, 248,287,288,289	6	Impact to optimal denning habitat for construction of the wharf	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP
201	1	Mitigation measures are insufficient to minimise impacts on devils. Night curfews should be proposed to protect devils and quolls from roadkill.	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP
243	1	The Roadkill Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan is an important document that should have been available for public comment. The plan's proposed inclusions lack detail. Limits on traffic are not described. Effectiveness of virtual fencing is disputed amongst reviewers and users. Review of its efficacy in Tasmania is recommended, i.e. units could be closer together and lower to the ground. Limits on vehicle speed need to be aggressively applied, i.e. speed limiting vehicles on Robbins Island, fitting vehicles with GPS trackers which can record speed. Roadkill monitoring should be both on island and on the approaches. Monitoring should be more than driving along roads as drive by surveys will not find all collisions. The pre-construction roadkill survey is a start, but should be repeated.	no	Proponent to consider as part of Roadkill RMAMP required as part of the CEMP.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
243,263	2	Devil facial tumour disease The DPEMP does not include provision to keep devils from using the bridge. The bridge may be a conduit to bring DFTD to Robbins Island. Impact from increased risk of DFTD due to the bridge.	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP
243	1	Impacts to clearing Mitigation measures through construction clearance are a minimalist approach. It is difficult to find devil dens by physical searches, with GPS/radio tracking breeding females the only reliable and efficient method. Finding and conserving dens may be important for the conservation of devils on Robbins Island. Decommissioning of dens of an endangered species results in a loss of dens and a progressive diminishing of den quality which could have implications for productivity.	yes	Further information on denning habitat has been requested from the proponent as part of the supplement.
243	1	Offsets Offsets should be direct, such as slowing traffic to reduce roadkill.	no	Proponent to note.
248	1	Ongoing operation of heavy industrial site 24 hrs a day as well as blasting, lights vibration through pile driving and excavator operations will probably force the devils to abandon the island.	no	Proponent to note.
251	1	As the Island is free of Devil Facial Tumour Disease (DFTD) the population should be protected. Decommissioning dens, the noise and disturbance from construction, ongoing 24/7 noise from operations and roadkill will impact the healthy devil population. Representor believes that devils rarely cross Robbins Passage.	no	Proponent to note.
279	1	Roadkill survey is out of date and requires updating. Impact on devil dens from the quarries.	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP and QMP.
Spotted tailed quoll/Eastern barred bandicoot				
1,21, 29,201,323,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	226	Potential increased roadkill risk from construction/operation traffic on spotted-tailed quoll and the eastern-barred bandicoot.	no	Addressed in S6.2 of DPEMP
Marrawah skipper				
176,323,327	3	Impact to habitat of Marrawah skipper	no	Covered in S6.2 of DPEMP.
Threatened vegetation communities				
28,52,176,183, 197,198,284,287,288,289,323,327,334,370,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	235	Clearance of native vegetation, including critically endangered <i>Eucalyptus viminalis</i> - <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> coastal forest and woodland (DVC)	no	Addressed in S6.1 of DPEMP
94,176	2	Impacts to biodiversity	no	Addressed in S6.1 of DPEMP
201, 238,284	3	Concerns in relation to clearance of threatened vegetation (WBR and NME) to widen Robbins Island Road.	no	Addressed in S6.1 of DPEMP
232	1	Clearance of 1000 ha of coastal, heathland and shrubland is significant, a complete survey of Robbins Island botany is required.	no	Total footprint clearance is 366 ha, with 280 ha clearance of native vegetation. Covered in S6.1 of DPEMP.
Threatened flora species				

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
176,197,198,201, 238, 248,279,287,288,289,323,334,370	13	Threatened flora species identified on Robbins Island, including northern leek orchid, Sun orchid, Parmotrema crinitum recorded on project site Expressed view that they should have ongoing protection.	no	Covered in S6.1 of DPEMP. Further surveys will be required prior to construction, as part of micrositing infrastructure, with results required in the Design Report as required by a permit condition, if approved.
Threatened freshwater aquatic fauna				
Green and gold frog				
263,323,283, 284	4	Green and Gold Frog resides in area to be impacted by footings, roads and construction activity in the area of Remarkable Banks. Concerns included: habitat fragmentation spread of weeds pathogens, including increased threat of Chytrid fungus feral animals alterations to hydrology.	no	Micrositing of infrastructure will be undertaken to minimise impact on habitat, as part of the Design Report. A weed and hygiene management plan will be required to address potential impacts from Chytrid fungus. Groundwater modelling will required as part of the CEMP. These will be required by permit conditions.
284	1	Threat to burrowing crayfish habitat	no	Proponent to note
Striped marsh frog, Eastern dwarf galaxias, Australian grayling				
57	1	Surveys for dwarf galaxias were inadequate and do not demonstrate likely absence of the species. All ephemeral freshwater habitat should be treated as if the dwarf galaxias is present. Dwarf galaxias vulnerable to changes in hydrology, concern with groundwater abstraction impact.	no	Proponent to note.
Noise emissions - construction				
283	1	Impacts of noise from quarry on residents	no	Covered in S6.8 of DPEMP and the preliminary QMP.
127	1	Noise impacts on wildlife and birds during construction	no	Proponent to consider in CEMP, as required by permit condition if approved.
204	1	Noise impacts on wildlife and birds during operation of turbines and construction	no	Proponent to consider in OEMP, as required by permit condition if approved.
Noise emissions - operation				
61	1	Noise measuring and modelling is inadequate, it should be measured at every property within a 2 km radius.	no	No residents within 2 km of the project.
21,376	2	Missing information - studies on noise impacts to nearby residents, including baseline information over longer time period.	no	Addressed in S6.8 of DPEMP
165,183,317,248,285,294	6	The windfarm will cause noise emissions. Some residents located between Jim's Plains and Robbins Island windfarms will be subject to constant noise. Noise can be heard from 7km to 10km.	no	Addressed in S6.8 of DPEMP. The windfarm will be required to meet noise emission limits as detailed in permit conditions if approved.
183,376	2	Turbines will cause an impact to users of Robbins Passage and the Montagu Camp ground.	no	Addressed in S6.8 of DPEMP. The windfarm will be required to meet noise emission limits as detailed in permit conditions if approved.
197, 198	2	Table 6-23 in EIS does not have interpretation. Representor wanted to understand if "crosses" indicate that noise levels are not acceptable at sensitive receiver.	no	Crosses indicate noise levels above criteria for all construction activities, including piling of bridge.
310	1	Bird and wildlife operation are not considered as sensitive receptors	no	Proponent to note
317	1	Turbine design not finalised, therefore noise impacts cannot be accurately modelled.	no	The windfarm will be required to meet noise emission limits. Prior to construction, the results of noise modelling based on the final turbine type and layout must be submitted to the Director, for approval. These will be required by permit conditions.
317	1	Recent court cases have found the noise from turbines can be a nuisance even within the allowable thresholds.	no	Proponent to note
376	1	Noise levels in area very low in evening, wind farm noise will be audible to residents living within 7-10 km of Robbins Island. Statements attached from residents or visitors residing within 8 km of the Cattle Hill Wind Farm, stating that noise from the Turbines is audible, is a nuisance, and causes sleep disturbance.	no	The windfarm will be required to meet noise emission limits as detailed in permit conditions if approved.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
376	1	Use of time weighted noise measurements is not representative of reality of low noise levels in areas at night.	no	Noise measurements were in accordance with the Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual (2008)
Marine and Coastal				
Robbins Passage - bridge				
28,176, 197,198,294,301,303,304,310, 317,343,346,34633,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,18 2,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,26 5,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,35 8,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	233	Sediment flow from construction has not been modelled in a detailed manner	no	Covered in S6.13 of DPEMP.
27,29,176,189,194,301,303,304,308,309,310,323,343,345,28333,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,4 4,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,18 2,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,26 5,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,35 8,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	235	Impacts on current industry in channel (commercial fisheries, oyster farms and sea grasses) not modelled	yes	Proponent to comment on potential impacts to current industry in Robbins Passage.
1,5,21,189,294,317,343,34633,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,18 2,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,26 5,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,35 8,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	228	Construction of the bridge may reduce access to the passage and beach for boating and recreation	no	Addressed in S6.13 of DPEMP.
57,311,370	3	Impact assessment is not based on actual data on flows and seabed composition. Hydrodynamic report does not include Black Reef. Report requires complete hydrology report and benthic survey. Full risk analysis with mitigating plans required.	no	Proponent to note.
1,13,21,27,176,183,196,275,301,303,304,308,309,310,317,323,343	17	The bridge and wharf may adversely impact ecosystems of the entire region of Robbins Passage and Back Banks Beach, including saltmarsh/wetlands.	no	Potential impacts are covered in DPEMP.
12,232,327	3	Concern that bridge will allow feral animals onto island	no	Covered in DPEMP
29,94,189,343	4	Bridge/causeway will alter hydrology and impact bird feeding areas	no	Covered in DPEMP
183,300,343	3	Concern that it will be a privately owned bridge over public land, to which public will have no access	no	Proponent to note

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
248,301,303,304,308,309,310,311,312,323,343,345,346	13	Baseline Marine Environment Assessments not adequate, more information required including: Identification of Marine Values Varying marine environment, including seasonal variation Construction impacts on bordering reefs (including sediment and particulate) Potential change in natural current and resulting impacts Potential impacts to reefs that sustain commercial and recreational fisheries Potential impacts to marine flora, fauna and broodstocks.	no	Proponent to note.
346	1	Marine Hydrodynamic Assessment has limitations Phase 2 did not have final bridge design to preform assessment Phase 3 not undertaken by a marine specialist, and does not address limitations previously addressed in Phase 2. No measurements of water currents to verify model.	no	Proponent to note
283	1	Phase 4 modelling report should be provided to address deficiencies in coastal and marine impact assessment.	no	Proponent to note
346	1	No assessment made regarding the <i>Living Marine Resources Management Act</i> (listed in the DPEMP Guidelines). No analysis of Projects consistency with the <i>Tasmanian State Coastal Policy 1996</i> .	no	Proponent to note
346	1	No reference to any marine mammal experts in any assessment of impacts in relation to marine mammal vessel strike and marine noise generation	no	Proponent to note
12733,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79,80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	221	Concern over major environmental change and resulting habitat disturbance from the bridge across Robbins passage.	no	Covered in DPEMP
204	1	Robbins Passage is a rare hydrology and ecological zone	no	
204	1	There appears to be no hydrodynamic and sedimentation models for the area and the effect this will have on the shoreline of the area. There are no mitigation measures to safeguard the ecosystem that would be acceptable.	no	Proponent to note
232	1	Change to tidal flows will cause impacts to environmental values of Boullanger Bay, with reduction in shorebird feeding habitat. A full hydrological study is required.	no	Covered in DPEMP
251	1	Concern that after approval there will be an amendment to build a causeway as originally proposed.	no	Any approval provided would not allow amendment to a causeway.
263	1	Both ramps will impact on saltmarsh. Saltmarsh extends along the margins on the southern side, although not shown on TASVEG mapping. The northern side of the ramp will require clearing of saltmarsh mapped by Prahalad & Kirkpatrick (2019). Also loss of potential OBP habitat. The bridge will impact on seagrass, this is not adequately acknowledged in the DPEMP. Potential issues with mobilisation of ASS, sedimentation and channel migration not adequately addressed. The loss of tidal flats as an important habitat area is not adequately acknowledged or addressed. The hydrodynamics assessment does not appear to take into account the ~ 170 steel piles used in bridge construction.	yes	Proponent to address comment in relation to saltmarsh in vicinity of bridge.
294	1	Detail design of the bridge is missing. No consideration of public access around bridge location, pre and post construction.	no	Proponent to note
295	1	Concern farming runoff impact on marine environment and flow of water from construction of the bridge.	no	Proponent to note

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
251	1	Boat access Concern the high arch section of the bridge currently lines up with deepest part of the channel and what will occur if the channel moves and recreational boating is blocked. If the channel silts up because of the pylons from the bridge, will the proponent dredge the channel to enable continued passage of recreational boats? If so, will this disturb ASS. Shoreline access Concern that shoreline access will be blocked after the bridge is built, excluding locals from the beach. Fish nursery areas The passage has become a a known breeding ground for the King George Whiting, concern over impact to this from bridge/causeway and disturbance to ASS.	no	Proponent to note
275,301,303,304	4	Impacts to commercial fisheries	no	Proponent to note
264	1	Concern with impact to abalone habitat from the bridge and wharf, particularly the reef structures to the east of Robbins Island and the impact to these from sediment runoff, both from construction and operation.	no	Proponent to comment.
346	1	No commitment in DPMP for feral cat management, or how cats will be kept from island (gate on bridge)	no	Covered in DPMP
Ransonnet Bay - wharf				
	1	Impact to Back Banks dune geoconservation site	no	Proponent to note
57	1	Severe dune erosion impacts	no	Proponent to note
197,198	2	Length of wharf not finalised	no	Proponent to note
251	1	Concern over impact to shoreline from the ramp part of the wharf. Concern over impact to Mosquito Sounds from tidal flow and impact this will have on fish breeding ground, as well as impact to waterbirds. Concern over impact from wharf on tidal flows and the impact to the main squid breeding ground in Ransonnet Bay. Concern over disturbance to ASS and impacts to marine life. DPMP is confusing in the length of the proposed wharf.	no	Proponent to note
29	1	Concern that wharf will be convenient for fish farms to become established	no	Proponent to note
Introduced marine pests				
311	1	<i>Unidaria pinnatifida</i> sited at Montagu. Full marine benthic report is required.	no	A survey for introduced marine pests will be undertaken following construction. Management of any identified marine pests will be required in the OEMP.
Air quality				
196,310,283	3	Concern that residents and the local environment in the area will be exposed to dust from the quarry. Lack of information about material being mined.	no	Addressed in the preliminary QMP. Closest residence is 4.6 km, permit conditions to manage air emissions will be required.
327,283	2	Dust from construction will cause harm to residents of Montagu and recreational uses to the area, as well as flora and fauna.	no	Addressed in the preliminary QMP. Closest residence is 4.6 km, permit conditions to manage air emissions will be required.
283	1	Representor concern that their house is located on map in section 3.6 Air Emissions of the Preliminary Quarry Management Plan and will be impacted by dust emissions	no	Addressed in the preliminary QMP. Closest residence is 4.6 km, permit conditions to manage air emissions will be required.
Surface water quality				
94	1	Impact to waterways from run-off from access roads construction	no	Covered in S6.6 of DPMP. Mitigation measures will be required to be detailed in CEMP. The CEMP will be required by permit condition, if approved.
27	1	Missing information - wastewater and sewerage impacts on aquatic and coastal areas	no	Proponent to note.
		Little consideration of the potential effects of run-off (including AS) during construction on nearby wetlands, marine environment, especially after heavy rains. EG Mosquito Inlet.	no	Covered in S6.6 of DPMP. Mitigation measures will be required to be detailed in CEMP. The CEMP will be required by permit condition, if approved.
296	1	Impacts on waterways from quarrying.	no	Covered in the Preliminary QMP.
Groundwater quality				
310,317	2	Hydrogeological Investigation based on assumptions and estimates. Proposal has potential to impact on groundwater of the island and therefore on agricultural productivity.	no	A groundwater management plan will be required prior to construction and will be required by a permit condition if approved.
Acid sulphate soils				
294	1	Impacts from ASS from disturbed ground		Addressed in S6.11 of DPMP.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
176,190,194, 197,198,376,310,317,343,34633,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,18 2,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,26 5,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329, 330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,35 8,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	230	Impacts from acid sulphate soils not addressed	no	Addressed in S6.11 of DPEMP. An Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan will be required as part of CEMP.
251	1	The location of the bridge will disturb acid sulphate soils (ASS) which are detrimental to the marine life in the passage. There is no mention of erosion control on the causeway ramps on each end or the disturbance this will cause to the ASS. Concern on lack of details about the piles and water flow around the piles is unknown, which could case erosion and ASS contamination in the passage.	no	Addressed in S6.11 of DPEMP. An Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan will be required as part of CEMP.
271	1	Unacceptable risk of disturbing ASS as a result of the proposed bridge across Robbins Passage. Impact on the prolific marine biodiversity which supports commercial and recreation fishing from ASS.	no	Addressed in S6.11 of DPEMP. An Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan will be required as part of CEMP.
Geoconservation				
27	1	Concern about removal of 1.6 million m ³ gravel, sand and rock from the island.	no	Proponent to note
171	1	The bridge design for Robbins Passage should be a fully-piled bridge design for to protect geoconservation values.	no	Proponent to note
263	1	Concern over considerable impact to geoconservation sites, such as the Remarkable Banks (2457), Walker Island - Back Banks (2445), Robbins Passage (2464). The infrastructure planned for Remarkable Banks has a large footprint and affects almost the entire extent, with extensive and intensive disturbance. The corridor proposed (Commitment 37) is not as wide as the one recommended in Appendix S. The infrastructure proposed at the wharf cuts in half the Back Banks Beach Dune geosite. The proposed bridge compromises the Robbins Island Tidal Channel System Geosite.	no	Proponent to note
251	1	Robbins Passage listed on the Tasmanian Geoconservation Database and should not be destroyed.	no	Proponent to note
Remarkable Banks				
171,197,198	3	Concern over impact to Remarkable Banks. WTG exclusion zone is a minimalist approach. WTG sites and roads impinge very closely on exclusion zone. Missing information - management measures to prevent disturbance during construction and operation. Disturbance will be spread across entire geoconservation site, which is inappropriate for managing conservation sites like this, as the landform complex is a whole integral landform system. Overall form and scale of Remarkable Banks are part of value, any more disturbance is unacceptable.	no	Proponent to note
171,323	2	The scale of the proposal, and associated access and infrastructure, should be reduced so that no development should occur on Remarkable Banks to protect geoconservation values.	no	Proponent to note
197,198,323	3	Hydrogeological study to be carried out after approval	no	Proponent to note
171	1	All geoconservation sites on island should be excluded from development	no	Proponent to note
Quarry				
310	1	Preliminary Quarry Management Plan is insufficient and Quarry Management Plan is incomplete	no	A QMP will be required by EPA and MRT prior to construction commencing, required by permit conditions if approved.
296	1	Impacts on noise, flora, fauna and waterways from quarrying	no	Covered in the Preliminary QMP.
Biodiversity - weed and disease				
12,242	2	Potential for disease to be brought to the island across bridge onto island	no	A weed and hygiene management plan will be required as part of the CEMP, required by permit condition if approved.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
29	1	Potential for invasive weeds to be brought to the island	no	A weed and hygiene management plan will be required as part of the CEMP, required by permit condition if approved.
244	1	Coastal heathlands are one of Tasmania's most biologically diverse vegetation communities and are of high conservation significance. The project will have a significant impact on coastal heathland vegetation.	no	Covered in S6.1 of DPEMP
Waste Management / Dangerous goods				
76,364	2	Disposal of damaged blades which are non-recyclable	no	Proponent to note
27	1	Fuel depot on island has potential to result in environmental harm	no	Covered in S6.10 of DPEMP. Permit conditions will be required for management of hazardous substances, if approved.
Decommissioning and rehabilitation				
37,76	2	Has a full closure plan be made available?	no	A Decommissioning and Rehabilitation Management Plan (DRP) will be required by permit condition, if approved.
317	1	Facilities to decommission a windfarm do not exist in the state	no	
102	1	Section 9 of the DPEMP should include a detailed assessment of the disposal of WTG components. Recyclable turbine blades should be considered, refer to Siemens Gamesa RecyclableBlade system. A \$30 million bond should be posted to ensure funds are available for refurbishment and decommissioning of WTGs.	no	Proponent to consider a detailed assessment of decommissioning and rehabilitation in preparing the DRP. A DRP will be required by permit conditions, if approved.
251,310	2	Decommissioning plan not included, and commitments are not provided in the case the project becomes unviable	no	A DRP will be required by permit condition, if approved.
Social and economic issues				
76,176	2	Financial risks to Circular Head residents.	yes	Proponent to comment on potential financial risks to Circular Head residents.
76,178,310	3	Questioning accuracy of employment numbers.	no	Proponent to note
94,248,176,178,183,185,186,194,196,310,327,343,376	13	No local economic benefit from the project, with short-term and long-term economic costs, construction jobs would be FIFO, increasing local rent.	no	Proponent to note
178,310	2	Number of local jobs are overstated. Procurement is not part of legislation which facilitates project, workforce composition not enforced. As it is a private project, no contractual conditions will be imposed for local content or training requirements, and most work will be sub let to interstate companies and workers. Based on employment at other windfarms, employment numbers provided are overestimated and will not be local as the required skills are not available in the region.	no	Proponent to note
176,196	2	Concern about how local economy (Council) will need to pay for upkeep and repair of roads impacted by increased traffic from proposal	no	Proponent to note
178	1	Concern that private renewable developers have historic safety issues, commonly use unlicensed work and underpay wages	no	Proponent to note
178	1	Windfarms will not lower power prices	no	Proponent to note
183,196,307,310,312,332,376	7	Social and economic benefits would be better if the site were protected (Ramsar listed)	no	Proponent to note
186	1	Robbins Island cattle muster will not have same cultural significance	no	Proponent to note
283	1	Statement in DPEMP "Class 1 sites are rare in the rest of the NEM". Representor questions the assessment of Class 1 sites, and how Robbins Island compares to other sites of the NEM.	no	Proponent to note
273	1	The socio-economic benefits of the project are overestimated, with little opportunity for local businesses due to the large capital investment.	no	Proponent to note
Visual impacts				

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
94,95,310,370,376,377,28333,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	227	Visual impacts - WTGs industrialise landscape, also transmission lines and easements will degrade visual amenity.	no	Visual impact outside EPA Board jurisdiction. To be considered by Council.
1,5,21,27,165,179,183,196,201,370,376,283	12	Visual Impacts on lifestyle for nearby residents	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
317,370,283	3	View shed mapping is inadequate and does not represent scale of development	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
201	1	Visual amenity Turbines will be visible from most of Circular Head Municipality and will scar the landscape. Views from the Nut will be interrupted. Industrialising Robbins Island will negatively impact the area and coastline which the community values as high importance. The proposal is visually dominating when compared to the natural and agricultural landscape.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
204	1	The turbines and bridge in the landscape will become an industrial development site. The project will bring unacceptable visual impact to the region.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
238	1	Development on the island and a bridge will completely destroy the aesthetic and uniqueness of this whole area.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
248	1	Visual amenity Turbines will be in direct view from Representors house and they are concerned WTGs and transmission lines will appear as a solid block of industrial zone in their viewing angle. With shadow flicker occurring for portions of the year. The photomontages produced were misleading, with WTGs undersized and were hazy, with clearer views for the majority of the year.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
251	1	View / amenity Concern over the visual impact from their house from the turbines. Concern the turbines will become the most noticeable landmark in Circular Head. The application does not meet the planning scheme requirements (refer below).	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
263	1	The Visual Impact Assessment does not adequately consider the loss of amenity from the construction of the bridge or meteorological masts. The bridge also alters the natural character of the passage with a loss of amenity for recreational users of the area. The WTGs will industrialise the landscape causing considerable visual impact.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
285	1	Concern over visual impact on the coastline and marine wildlife	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
287	1	Photomontages are false, providing misleading information	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
290	1	The WTGs will be visible from 64.9 km away.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
298	1	Visual impact on the area will be high	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
317,343	2	No photo montages provided of bridge and wharf	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction.
Traffic impacts				
1,5,21,27,30,52,285,377,283	9	Traffic disruption	no	Proponent to note
94, 248,196,283	4	Adverse impact during construction, adversely impacting local communities and wildlife	no	Addressed in S6.18 and S6.2 of DPMP.
183, 196,201, 238, 248, 285, 287, 288, 289,370,377,283	12	Traffic impact assessment insufficient and outdated. Assessment allows for 42 month timeframe however it is anticipated construction will take 66 months. Not representative of current traffic.	yes	Proponent to address impact from additional 22 month construction timeframe. Proponent to up-date traffic volumes.
238, 248	2	Concern over the source of rock and having this trucked along Montagu Road and the impact this will have on the road and payment of road upgrades. Concern over payment for road maintenance.	no	All gravel will be sourced from Robbins Island. No material will be transported to site along Montagu Road.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
248,283	2	Heavy vehicle traffic will make narrow Montagu Road more dangerous. Particularly adding 1000s of 65 tonne gravel trucks. Moving large components will require the road to be closed, isolating residents. Increased noise, vibration and lights from oversize vehicles will disturb sleep and reduce quality of lifestyle for those living near the road.	no	Proponent to note
377	1	Speed limit identified in DPEMP at Montagu listed as 60km/h, when actually 70km/hr. Speed limit identified in DPEMP at Montagu Road towards Scopis is 80km/hr, when actually 100km/hr. The road is narrow and dangerous and should be widened. School bus signs are needed.	no	Proponent to note
287	1	Vehicle movement numbers are obsolete, with February 2021 counts at 9352, 6000 more than in the TIA. The TIA did not include the Bass Highway or Mella Road.	yes	Proponent to provide up-to-date traffic volumes where available.
Electromagnetic interference				
310	1	Electromagnetic interference not dealt with sufficiently in DPEMP	no	Covered in S6.23.4 and Appendix EE of the DPEMP
Aboriginal heritage				
176,248,315,197,198,296,312,315,327,334,370,28333,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,95,96,98,100,101,103,104,105,106,107,109,110,112,114,116,121,122,126,127,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,145,146,147,148,149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202,203,205,206,209,210,211,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	232	Proponent has not conducted a detailed aboriginal heritage assessment. Aboriginal heritage requires further assessment.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction. Aboriginal heritage assessment undertaken. Additional assessment to be undertaken following detailed design and micro-siting.
194,197,198,287,288,289,327,334,28333,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,95,96,98,100,101,103,104,105,106,107,109,110,112,114,116,121,122,126,127,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,145,146,147,148,149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202,203,205,206,209,210,211,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	229	Request for Robbins Island to be declared a Significant Aboriginal Area by Federal Environment Minister.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
176,183,196,279,284	5	Impact on cultural values of Robbins Island	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
2,27,30,287,288,289,370	7	Impact to Aboriginal heritage sites	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
183,327	2	A registered Aboriginal heritage site has already been damaged by being covered in gravel	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
183,315,317	3	The island is an important cultural gathering place for Aboriginal people, and access is not being allowed for education or ceremonies.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
128	1	Representor provided a background to Aboriginal connection to Robbins Island. Heritage assessments have uncovered sites which are physical items left behind by Aboriginal people that lived on Robbins Island, their spirit still remains. Robbins Island is a significant cultural and spiritual place for Aboriginal people of Tasmania. A place that holds the footsteps, stories and spirits of ancestors. The Island is highly significant to Aboriginal people.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
201	1	Aboriginal people of the regions are strongly opposed to the development because of the significant cultural significance of the area.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
204,232,285,287	4	Robbins Island is culturally important to the Tasmanian Aboriginal community. The area is highly significant for its values	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
248	1	Any sites discovered should be protected.	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
258	1	<p>The Representer has a significant interest in Robbins Island, its tangible Aboriginal heritage, its Cultural Landscape and the stories and role in that the island plays lutruwita/Tasmania's shared history.</p> <p>Robbins Island and the surrounding sea scape, including Robbins Passage is an Aboriginal Cultural landscape.</p> <p>Representer condemns the Planning Report, reducing 40,00 year history to the discovery of several Aboriginal artefacts.</p> <p>The Representer supports the application for the protection of Robbins Island under the Commonwealth's <i>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984</i> which is under active consideration by the Federal Government.</p> <p>Tasmania's Aboriginal heritage protection legislation is inadequate to protect Aboriginal cultural heritage values and given the significance of the Robbins Island and Passage to Aboriginal people, the planning permit should be rejected.</p> <p>The Aboriginal Heritage Assessment Report is a product of flawed legislation. The report does not assess the impact of the development on Aboriginal heritage values.</p> <p>Further research and reporting should be conducted to establish the extent of the Cultural Landscape values and impacts of the proposal on these values.</p> <p>The Minister is required to consider the impact of the proposed development on the island as a whole in accordance with section 14 of the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975</i>.</p> <p>Aboriginal people have concerns on the impact of the proposed development on the mutton bird (yula) migration, breeding and viability.</p> <p>Also concerns over the scale and location and its impacts on natural heritage values, visual and other amenity.</p>	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction
Planning Matters				
52,61,165,167,169,176,183,194,196,197,198,251,283,307,310,317,323,327,332,334,346,346,370,28333,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,95,96,98,100,101,103,104,105,106,107,109,110,112,114,116,121,122,126,127,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,145,146,147,148,149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202,203,205,206,209,210,211,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	244	<p>Height - visual amenity</p> <p>Height of WTGs at 270 m, higher than permitted height A.3.2.</p> <p>The visual impact will be obvious to all people in the Circular Head community.</p> <p>The photomontages down play the views of the proposal.</p> <p>Property owners who adjoin Robbins Passage will be negatively impacted.</p> <p>26.4.2 - Impact on visual amenity.</p>	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction. To be considered by Council.
52,183,194,196,197,198,238,283,307,317,323,327,334,346,37033,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,95,96,98,100,101,103,104,105,106,107,109,110,112,114,116,121,122,126,127,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,145,146,147,148,149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202,203,205,206,209,210,211,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	235	<p>Environmental Management Zone (EMZ), concerns include:</p> <p>Bridge and wharf do not meet EM zone standards of the planning scheme.</p> <p>No detailed design of wharf.</p> <p>No landowner consent documents in DA.</p> <p>The bridge is sited in an area of significant ecological, scientific, geomorphological, cultural and aesthetic value.</p> <p>Impact on Robbins Passage.</p> <p>The bridge will have drastic long term effects on the fragile ecosystem, with changing in water flows impacting fish species and birds relying on tidal flats as well as sea grass.</p>	no	EMZ - Outside EPA Board jurisdiction. To be considered by Council.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
52,183,238,248,284,20133,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	226	<p>Performance criteria for Development in a shoreline (E10.6.2) have not been addressed. Concerns include:</p> <p>Bridge and wharf have not adequately addressed.</p> <p>No photomontages of the bridge.</p> <p>Sediment from construction and sediment flow post construction has not been modelled in a detailed manner.</p> <p>No modelling or mitigation strategies for acid sulphate soils (ASS) and their impact on the channel, including industry in the channel.</p> <p>Impact of wharf on seagrass beds to the west.</p> <p>Impact from bridge on access for boating and recreation.</p> <p>The project does no minimise visual impact and therefore contravenes clause (P1)(c). The visual amenity will be changed forever.</p> <p>Impacts on marine life from release of ASS during construction of the bridge.</p> <p>Seagrasses will be killed from exposure to concrete dust from construction along with the dumping of large quantities of rock.</p> <p>Community will lose access to the end of Robbins Road during construction.</p> <p>Montague campgrounds will have view of an industrial site or turbine flicker.</p>	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction. To be considered by Council.
183	1	Concern about previous construction of gates to block access to passage	no	Proponent to note
36	1	Rezoning from Rural would require loss of farming land	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction. To be considered by Council.
Other matters				
Marinus Link				
28,323,354,356,381,	6	Tasmania does not need Marinus link	no	Marinus is a separate project requiring a separate environmental assessment.
146,190,208,238,251,263,266,294,323,283	10	<p>Proposal should not be assessed separately from Marinus Link, as it requires Marinus Link to be viable and there is concern about that viability, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern over Marinus not proceeding and the wind farm becoming a stranded asset - Could be costly, like Basslink - Concern over unknown funding of Marinus - Final decision on Marinus Link not due until 2024 - Marinus will not happen until 2029 - Analysis of Marinus provided in paper "<i>Marinus Link and Battery of the Nation – Wrong Way, Go Back. An analysis of the economics and greenhouse gas impact of Marinus Link and Battery of the Nation. Bruce Mountain and Steven Percy</i>" 	no	Marinus is a separate project requiring a separate environmental assessment.
323,283	2	Separating Assessment of the proposal from Marinus Link and Transmission line undermines the EPBC and EMPC Acts.	no	Marinus and the transmission line are separate projects, requiring separate environmental assessment.
Transmission Line				
197,198	2	Visual impact of transmission line	no	Transmission line is a separate project requiring a separate environmental assessment.
197,198,312,317,283	5	<p>Impacts of transmission line are not considered, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land clearing, - Landscape fragmentation, - Impacts to fauna and other cumulative impacts of supporting infrastructure, - Treating as a separate proposal does not allow public to comment on the entire project. 	no	Transmission line is a separate project requiring a separate environmental assessment.
171,196,323,332,283	5	<p>Concern that transmission line is to be assessed separately, and if wind farm has already been approved then there will be pressure on planning authority to approve transmission line.</p> <p>Undermines purposes of EPBC Act.</p> <p>Contrary to principles about piecemeal applications set out by the majority of the High Court in Pioneer Concrete (QLD) Pty Ltd v Brisbane City Council (1980).</p>		Transmission line is a separate project requiring a separate environmental assessment.
293	1	Transmission line is vital information that should be included in the assessment of this project.		Transmission line is a separate project requiring a separate environmental assessment.
Other matters				

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
95,197,198,251,284,296,312,317,323,334,34533,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	231	Missing information - proponent has not identified the number of WTGs, how tall WTGs will be, how long the wharf will be, foundation design of the WTGs	no	To be included in Design Report following micrositing. The Design Report be required to be approved by the Director, EPA, prior to construction and will be required by permit condition, if approved.
95,197,198,310,317,323,33433,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	227	Missing information - micrositing of WTGs and roads to protect threatened flora and devil dens and reduce risk of bird strike	no	To be included in Design Report following micrositing. The Design Report be required to be approved by the Director, EPA, prior to construction and will be required by permit condition, if approved.
197,198,296,310,317,323,334,34533,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	228	Missing information - sediment movement and sand accretion studies	no	Covered in S6.13 DPEMP
197,198,323,327,334,37033,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100,101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149,150,153,154,155,156,160,161,162,163,164,166,167,168,169,170,173,174,175,177,179,180,182,202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211,213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227,228,229,230,231,233,234,235,236,239,240,241,245,246,247,249,253,254,255,256,257,262,265,266,268,278,280,282,272,290,291,297,300,306,313,316,318,319,321,322,324,325,326,328,329,330,331,333,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,344,347,348,349,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,369,371,372,373,374,375,383	226	Missing information - traffic movements	yes	Proponent to clarify construction timeframe and traffic impact. Refer above.
296,317	2	Impact to Robbins Island Road from traffic	no	Outside EPA Board jurisdiction. Matter for Council.
57,323	2	Assessment of significance of impacts is subjective, speculative and not precautionary	no	Proponent to note
283	1	Site should be Ramsar listed	no	Proponent to note
2,12,60,61,220,277, 278	7	Alternatives should be considered, which will have less impact on ecosystems. For example, offshore windfarms or wave/tide generation windfarms.	no	Proponent to note

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
284,320	2	Alternative sites not considered for project, as required by PSGs	no	Proponent to note
19,83	2	Representors do not like WTGs	no	Proponent to note
86,87,300,343	4	Generally against the project	no	Proponent to note
90	1	Enormity of the proposed disturbance to the sensitive Robbins Island landscape. Proposed management and monitoring recommendations do not mitigate for impact to these values.	no	Proponent to note
1,21,100,101,275	5	Impact to property values	no	Proponent to note
2,4,196,283	4	Concern about fairness of public consultation process Large proportion of local residents will find it challenging to understand and respond to large amounts of complex information Not a representative method to gauge community support Some community members feel dismissed.	no	Proponent to note
2,4,165,167,176,186,194,275,310,377,283	11	Concern about negative impacts to tourism	no	Proponent to note
2,23,24,29,165,167,169,179,183,238,251	11	Statements about location being wrong, for example: There are more suitable sites with lower environmental values The west coast has more suitable sites Concern about climate change, but believes the location of the wind farm is the wrong location with too many biodiversity impacts.	no	Proponent to note
31,204,263	3	Project is considered unsustainable according to sustainable development context in Tasmania. It does not comply with the <i>State Policies and Projects Act 1993</i> , and the <i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993</i> Sustainable Development objectives One representor included a detailed argument in attached paper "Making sustainability laws work, and application of Scarcity Multiplier Theory" that the proposal is unsustainable under the RMPS definition of 'sustainable development', and that no industrial developments can be considered sustainable under the current definition.	no	Proponent to note
176,275,300,377	4	Concern about cultural impacts in community	no	Proponent to note
186	1	Proposal should not be considered in isolation Windfarm development in Tasmania should be considered wholistically Cumulative impacts of all windfarms on species such as eagles, raptors and bats should be considered	no	Proponent to note
273	1	The project does not present a cumulative impact assessment and does not consider the combined environmental impact of Robbins Island, Jims Plains and the proposed transmission line, in particular the unacceptable risk to the WTE population and disturbance of ASS.	no	Proponent to note
194,320,381	3	The state requires a coordinated approach to wind farm development. Accessibility to existing high voltage power corridors Avoid environmental damage to vulnerable areas, Reduce visual impact on coastlines.	no	Proponent to note
317	1	A proportion of proposed funding should be allocated to be spent within the Circular Head Community	no	Proponent to note
310	1	Community Benefit Fund is not enforceable	no	Proponent to note
323	1	2010 Guidelines for Robbins Island considered environmental impact of a smaller proposal for the island, and should be publicly available. Proposal relies on outdated studies.	no	Proponent to note
323	1	Hardstand area in North Barker report represented as 2,000m ³ , when instead 10,000m ³ . Report based on incorrect impact area.	no	Proponent to comment.
323	1	Adaptive management for mitigation not possible given infrastructure is fixed	no	Proponent to note
323	1	Disturbance footprint of the proposal is larger than the boundary of the site	no	Proponent to note
323	1	Areas of Robbins Island have already been cleared or burnt without approval under EPBC and EMPC Acts or FPA, with no prosecution of land owners which are partners in development. Environmental assessments consider altered ecological conditions after these activities as baseline. The restored landscape should be considered as a baseline.	no	Proponent to note
323	1	Wind speed rather than rotor speed not provided in assessment, misleading to the reader. Underestimates the risks to avian fauna.	no	Proponent to note
332	1	Concern that permit conditions will not be enforced, resulting in impacts to threatened species	no	Proponent to note
332	1	Carbon footprint of project is high	no	Proponent to note
346	1	Final plans will not be shown to public until after approvals are granted. No guarantee that the recommendations in preliminary plans will be included in final plans.	no	Preliminary plans are a minimum that the final plans must address. Final Plans will be required by permit conditions if approved.

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
332,381	2	The community does not support the proposal	no	Proponent to note
201	1	Proposal has been divisive for the Circular Head community	no	Proponent to note
208	1	Missing information and key studies.	no	Proponent to note
144	1	Inappropriate site location for wind farm, environmentally risky and contentious. Remote and unspoiled natural environment. Deficient on impact on infrastructure (wharf, bridge) on projected sea level rise as well as sea level rise on shorebird roosting sites. Impact on the one black blade on night navigation amidst turbine blades. Lack of government leadership to ensure renewable energy infrastructure is suitably located. Concern on competence of Council to consider DA. New dams will attract more avian species. Impact on swamp harrier. Increased food availability as a result of turbine collisions and the increase in roadkill and eagle scavenging.	no	Proponent to note
204	1	The area should have had an assessment as an integrated environmental zone. Impact to surrounding land use.	no	Proponent to note
253	1	DA is not compliant with planning scheme, environmental legislation and is missing key studies. As a Montagu resident, deeply concerned about the irreversible environmental damage to the significant and sensitive part of Circular Head.	no	Proponent to note
287	1	Housing shortage in the area cannot accommodate another 350 people	no	Proponent to note
294	1	Justification for the project is lacking. The project is reliant on marinus or hydrogen production to be viable.	no	Proponent to note
Supportive Representations				
89,314	2	Visual amenity - being visual should not influence the viability of the development Noise - prevailing wind direction would carry noise away from residential areas Bridge access will be a positive for servicing farmland and reduce heavy machinery across the sand flats Tourism - boost to the area, for tourism, accommodation providers Community - community fund will improve infrastructure and facilities Road transport - extra truck movements that occurred during construction of Woolnorth did not raise public concerns Avian wildlife - independent experts completed surveys Renewable energy - a positive Fossil fuels - moves away from fossil fuel use Stewardship of Robbins Island by landowners is positive Development process is rigorous.	no	
97,187	2	Will provide for sustainability in agriculture, enhance renewable energy reputation. Invigorate rural towns.	no	
99,151,157,159,172,184,187,188,314,382	10	Significant economic benefits to the region. Benefits from construction jobs and ongoing employment, and the flow on effect to the local community and entire region Significant project as part of the overall energy strategy for Tasmania.	no	
4,10,11,22,26,32,125,151,157,159,172,181,184,187,193,199,314,382	18	Supportive of proposal for trades/employment opportunities and economic development in region. Will provide employment opportunities and training for the next generation in civil construction. Will enable development of new industries	no	
11,17,18,32,151,157,159,172,188,191,192,195,199	13	Supportive of renewable energy project Wind power cost effective	no	
195	1	Supportive of project, but a proportion of proposed funding should be allocated to be spent within the Circular Head Community	no	
195	1	Future DAs for windfarms should include application to incorporate secondary form of supplementary back up supply of electricity generation	no	
113	1	Project key benefits: Employment and opportunity Confidence for construction companies and local businesses to Invest in their people and capacity to meet demand Opportunities for training Green energy will assist in ensuring net zero emissions are achieved by 2050 The energy generated from the project has the potential to develop new industries in the state.	no	
117	1	Great location for a wind farm and a win win for Circular Head, employment and local business.	no	
118	1	A local family business owner commented Project will provide long term contracting work for local contractors and associated support businesses Extra need for accommodation which in turn will boost housing construction. Economic benefits to Circular Head and Tasmanian economy.	no	

All representations	Total number of reps.	Comments and Issues	Further info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
119	1	North west business supports the project as work for local Tasmanians and Tasmanian owned and operated businesses, with wages and profits spent locally.	no	
120	1	Representor supports the project as it Positions Smithton as a regional centre which can expand, including housing, investment, new businesses and jobs. Renewable energy provides energy security for Tasmania, and is the way forward in the immediate future as Australia moves away from fossil fuel energy use. Sympathetic to concerns of those who oppose the project and wants protections to flora, fauna and Aboriginal heritage. Understands the concerns in relation to visual impacts but acknowledges that farms, houses, towns and road also change the landscape. Satisfied bird strike mitigation measures will operate.	no	
124	1	Representor supports the project - With increasing energy demand, a goal of net zero emissions by 2050 and current national production of renewable energy at 25%, the project is needed. Land beneath the towers can be grazed and will enable supply of food. Environmental impacts must be managed and assessment must be undertaken and historic and indigenous heritage can be managed. Growth opportunities for existing business in accommodation, hospitality, transport, logistics and supplies will provide economic benefit to households in the area. Technological improvements in turbine efficiency and output and energy parks are an opportunity for growth. The project will be a huge benefit to the local community an to the planet.	no	
207	1	Development is crucially important for Circular Head, both for the area's advancement and the renewable energy contribution within Tasmania and on the mainland. The development would provide business and employment growth.	no	
237	1	Representor is strongly supportive of continued sustainable development of Tasmania's renewable energy resources, providing energy security, effective competition and ultimately lower power prices for Tasmania, The project will generate massive direct and indirect jobs and economic activity.	no	
260	1	Supportive of project and a step forward for Tasmania in the renewable energy sector. Rather than a mine there are steel wind turbines which is less disturbing.	no	
261	1	Support of the project. A good fit with Tasmania's long term clean green image.	no	
281	1	Supportive of project based on benefits to the whole community despite the negativity.	no	
286	1	Supportive of project Appreciate others have concerns with visual impact along the coastline, however Representor does not mind them. The project will make a significant contribution to the local economy.	no	
292	1	Supportive of development, however, no medical facilities available for existing local population, this will need to be addressed, and will there be public access to the project when completed.	no	
299	1	Supportive of the project and the benefits it will bring to the community and future investment. Also have faith in the landowners who love the area as much as the community, to have the best interest of the Circular Head area.	no	