

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Indépendant Acoustic Engineer
Date: 24 January 2024 at 6:21 am
To: Info Lal Lal [REDACTED]
Cc: Gustaf Reutersward [REDACTED]

SL

Morning Nathan,
Official Enquiry

Could you please explain LLWF understanding of **Independent** Acoustic Engineer, in relation to the requirements of the Planning Permit.

Regards
Owen

On 22 Jan 2024, at 10:14 am, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Gustaf,

Under the requirements of the Planning Permit, the Acoustic Compliance reports must be conducted by a suitably qualified **Independent** acoustic engineer. Do you consider yourself to be **independent** if you require to be instructed by LLWF to answer fair and reasonable questions relating to reports you have completed.

Regards
Owen

On 22 Jan 2024, at 9:47 am, Gustaf Reutersward <[REDACTED]> wrote:

FYI – another one from Owen this time

Will not respond unless instructed to.

Regards
G

Gustaf Reutersward
Technical Director - Acoustics & Vibration

D [REDACTED] O [REDACTED]
M [REDACTED] E [REDACTED]

SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd
Lvl 11, 176 Wellington Parade, East Melbourne VIC Australia 3002

SLR acknowledges the traditional custodians of Country and recognises their continuing stewardship and connection to land, water and community. We pay our respect to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures; and to Elders past and present.

This e-mail is intended only for the addressee. Its use is limited to that intended by the author at the time and it is not to be distributed without the author's consent. Unless otherwise stated, SLR accepts no liability for the contents of this e-mail except where subsequently confirmed in writing. The opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of SLR. This e-mail may be subject to a claim of legal privilege.

If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the author and delete this message immediately.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2024 9:32 AM
To: Gustaf Reutersward <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED]; Anton Ponomarenko <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: LLWF

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi
Gusta

f,

If you could also answer/confirm the below questions also;

10. Did LLWF inform you of the background monitoring that was conducted by Marshall Day Acoustics at St Save Monastery (I14aa)?

St Sava Monastery (I14aa) was included in Sonus report and is located within the 35-40db contour approx 1km from the nearest turbine.

Regards

Owen

On 22 Jan 2024, at 7:46 am, [REDACTED] wrote:

Morning Gustaf,

Could you please answer/explain the below questions so I can better understand your reporting. Reports referred to below have been supplied to myself from LLWF or the Responsible Authority.

1. What authority did you have to change requirement 4.1 of LLWF NCTP by moving the noise logger some 63m outside the required 3m-20m distance from dwelling K15aa?

2. 4.4.2 of NCTP sets out the requirements for the identifications of SAC's. Why have receiver and survey locations from Yendon section of the wind farm been included in the Elaine report? In my opinion attended observations for the Elaine Noise Assessment have failed to meet the requirements of NCTP.

3. You have stated on 01 December 2022 that Interim Noise Monitoring J14aa was conducted in general accordance with the NCTP, only one (1) attended observation was conducted. Could you provide an explanation as to how this would result in a true reflection of wind farm emissions at J14aa.

4. As a requirement of the NCTP background monitoring for K15aa was to be updated and the report to be submitted to the responsible authority prior to commencement of operation. Did you notify LLWF that the background monitoring at K15aa February 2021 would not meet the requirements of NCTP?

5. What relevant experience with wind farm acoustics did Minh Nguyen have when conducting Noise monitoring before January 2021?

6. Was SLR 640.11872-R04-v1.4 the first version of Elaine Post-construction Noise Assessments as shown in Document control of v-1.7?

7. Could you confirm what version of the Elaine report was first sent to ARUP for verification? David Spink has communicated v1.5 dated Mar 2022 as the original PC report and v1.7 as the updated PC report.

8. As per ARUP's verification report with regards to 5. Approach to Verification Process, David Spink only inspected Elaine WEF site. How was Yendon receiver and survey locations discussed and their relevance to the Elaine section?

9. Did LLWF make you aware of the reasons why they engaged yourself to provide a summary of pre-construction noise prediction, post-construction noise monitoring and compliance assessment for the Elaine wind farm? Ref SLR 640.11872.00100-L01-v1.1

Regards

Owen

