



MINUTES OF MEETING

CRUDINE RIDGE WIND FARM COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CCC)

10:00 am, Monday 12th February 2013
Pyramul Hall
Minutes taken by: Siobhan Isherwood

Attendees:

Margaret MacDonald-Hill	Independent Chair
Ed Mounsey	Wind Prospect CWP (WPCWP)
Siobhan Isherwood	Wind Prospect CWP
Lyell Miller	Community representative
Vera Tomlinson	Community representative
Laureen Price (for Max Price)	Community representative
Owain Rowland-Jones	Community representative
Alan Heath	Community representative
Karen Croake	Community representative
Esme Martens	Community representative
David Shaw	Director, Environmental, Planning & Building Services, Bathurst Regional Council
Catherine Van Laeren	Group Manager, Development and Services, Mid-Western Regional Council
John Weatherley	Councillor, Mid-Western Regional Council
Grant Christopherson	Observer, Office of Environment and Heritage

Apologies:

None

ITEM	ACTIONS
1.0 Welcome and Introductions 10am – Meeting Opened Margaret MacDonald-Hill, Independent Chair welcomed all to the meeting and invited all to provide a brief introduction to themselves.	
2.0 Apologies None, Laureen Price standing in for Max Price at Margaret's invitation.	
3.0 Declaration of Interest	

<p>Margaret MacDonald-Hill declared her interest as Independent Chair of the CCC, engaged by Wind Prospect CWP. She advised she is also a Member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Ministers' Arbitration Panel.</p> <p>Esme Martens noted that while she is a Councillor for Mid-Western Regional Council, her role on the Crudine Ridge CCC is as a community representative.</p>	
<p>4.0 Role of the Committee</p> <p>Margaret acknowledged that the CCC is an advisory committee only, and that ultimately (once the draft guidelines are finalised) all members will have to be approved by the Director General of the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.</p> <p>The CCC, however, and individual roles within it are important, as it provides a conduit between Wind Prospect CWP (WPCWP) on behalf of Crudine Ridge Wind Farm Pty Ltd (CRWF) and the community. WPCWP is here to hear what the committee has to say.</p> <p>Any information discussed during the meeting is public information, and may be passed along to other community members.</p>	
<p>5.0 Overview of the project</p> <p>Presentation slides were provided, and will accompany the minutes.</p> <p>The presentation included an introduction of the company and the project, including the project's location, size and current status in the development pathway. Information about the consultation pathway and assessment results was also provided.</p> <p>Esme asked about blocks with development applications (DAs) in the area.</p> <p>Ed stated that there were, and these are discussed in the EA. Concerns was raised by Esme, and generally discussed that the project would hinder people's ability to build or devalue their house. Esme also made the point that properties or people have to be compensated if property value is affected. Catherine VL added that if a development entitlement (DE) or DA is negated, property value would be impacted because 'bankability' of the land would decrease (Banks recognise the intrinsic value of DEs on land, and this has flow on effects for mortgages etc).</p>	

<p>Responses to these concerns included: Discussions have been ongoing with people in the area, but that these have been more about subdivision than DA/DEs. At the end of the day, as both forms of development are permissible, they are both still entitled to go ahead. Wind farms are required to meet a merit based assessment, and property value does not play a role in that assessment (the Taralga Judgement was noted).</p> <p>Lyell noted that his house is within the 2km setback zone, yet he has not been contacted about a neighbour agreement. Ed committed to reviewing the EA and the layout and responding after the meeting.</p> <p>Other discussion points made include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The arbitrary nature of the 2km setback (and that this is determined by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DoPI), not the Proponent - Lack of early consultation with the local community - Use of Prices Lane during construction (it will not be used) - Ed Mounsey encouraged people to read the EA and lodge a submission with the DoPI, or feel free to contact the DoPI or Ed with any questions. 	<p>ACTION: Ed to follow up proximity of turbines to Lyell Miller's house</p>
<p>6.0 General Business</p> <p>Margaret asks for any comments or questions.</p> <p><u>Access to the EA:</u></p> <p>Apparently the EA (hard copy) has not been available at Bathurst Regional Council (BRC). Ed said he had contacted BRC about this issue after a call to the office. David Shaw said he was unaware of the issue, but that if asked for, it would be provided.</p> <p>Catherine VL noted that people often take entire copies of the EA from the Exhibition display, and other factors make it hard to maintain hard copy access for the public. Further access issues noted included access to lack of access to the internet, and lack of computers in the area. Decisions about the distribution of hard copies are made by the DoPI, and if issues arise, it is a good idea to raise it with them.</p> <p><u>Draft Guidelines:</u></p> <p>Owain asked if the EA had been based fully on the draft guidelines. Ed replied that it had not, that it had been based</p>	

on the checklist provided by the DoPI which provided stipulations for the Crudine Ridge Assessment /EA.

Decommissioning:

Owain raised the need for a decommissioning bond, in the case of financial hardship for the company or a change in the political support for wind energy.

Ed replied that decommissioning provisions in relation to Crudine Ridge Wind farm are addressed in the EA.

Owain also commented that CRWF is a \$10 company. Ed responded that it is common for power generation projects to be established in this manner when they are to be project financed. Entities that are project financed rely on project cashflows to underpin all associated costs with the project. Through obtaining a power purchase agreement, cashflows can be guaranteed for the project.

Catherine VL asked what guarantee there is that there is enough money flowing into the project to fund decommissioning.

Ed replied that again this position is outlined in the EA; if necessary a fund can be initiated from year 15 of operation (as power purchase agreements are typically 15 years long).

Traffic/stock movements:

Owain asked how movement of stock will occur during construction. Ed replied that construction won't happen without communication. Alan notes that if you have your stock movement sign out, you've got right of way. That is the law. Ed noted that it will be covered in the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

David Shaw noted that BRC won't be opposing the development.

General Environmental Issues:

Lyell raised the following issues: Access to water (doesn't want it coming from the Crudine River), the local Koala colony, cultural heritage and impacts on areas of significance, lack of information on how much it will cost to make the roads passable.

Responses from Ed included: On all issues raised, there are

<p>commitments within the EA. All costs are to be borne by CRWF. Road works are an ongoing discussion; WPCWP on behalf of CRWF disagrees with MWRC about the extent of works, but recognises that the costs sit with the company. Attention is drawn to the Statement of Commitments Chapter of the EA, which has bullet point commitments on a wide number of issues. All necessary licences and permits will be obtained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are cases of landowners being sued for impacts to neighbouring properties. Ed notes that CRWF indemnifies landowners for all costs. - Community fund is based on installed capacity, up to just over \$3 million for the life of the project, or up to \$170,000 per annum. It is not up to CRWF to decide how that money is spent. - Local employment is preferred where the skills are available - Accommodation camp not being proposed. 	
<p>7.0 Meeting Schedule</p> <p>Meeting agreed that a media release could be released with all names included.</p> <p>Next meeting to be held Tuesday 18th June at 10am, Pyramul Hall (this will be once submissions have been made and responded to).</p> <p>Meeting Closed at 12.01pm</p>	



MINUTES OF MEETING

CRUDINE RIDGE WIND FARM COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CCC)

11:00 am, Monday 15th July 2013
Pyramul Hall
Minutes taken by: Siobhan Isherwood

Attendees:

Margaret MacDonald-Hill	Independent Chair
Lisa Andrews	Assisting Chair
Ed Mounsey	Wind Prospect CWP (WPCWP)
Siobhan Isherwood	Wind Prospect CWP
Lyell Miller	Community representative
Vera Tomlinson	Community representative
Max Price	Community representative
Owain Rowland-Jones	Community representative
Alan Heath	Community representative
Karen Croake	Community representative
Esme Martens	Community representative
Mark Lyndon	Strategic / Statutory Planner, Mid-Western Regional Council
John Weatherley	Councillor, Mid-Western Regional Council
Grant Christopherson	Observer, Office of Environment and Heritage
Judy Rowland-Jones	Observer
Judy Olson	Observer
Ron Olson	Observer

Apologies:

Catherine Van Laeren
Alan Heath

ITEM	ACTIONS
1.0 Welcome and Introductions 11:07am – Meeting Opened Margaret MacDonald-Hill, Independent Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Introduced both Mark Lyndon and Lisa Andrews. Lisa will be assisting Margaret with her workload.	
2.0 Apologies Catherine Van Laeren and Alan Heath.	
3.0 Declaration of Interest Margaret MacDonald-Hill declared her interest as	

Independent Chair of the CCC, engaged by Wind Prospect CWP. She advised she is also a Member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Ministers' Arbitration Panel.	
4.0 Role of the Committee As per Meeting 1.	
5.0 Confirmation of Minutes Draft minutes from Meeting 1: 12 th February, 2013 are accepted. Moved: Lyell Miller Seconded: Vera Tomlinson	
6.0 Business Arising 1. Ed Mounsey committed to providing Lyell Miller with follow up information regarding the proximity of the Project wind turbines to his property. <u>This was undertaken.</u> 2. Provision of a hard copy of the EA to be left in Pyramul Hall for use by the local community. <u>This was undertaken.</u> <u>Mail:</u> In: 19/2 from Siobhan to Margaret regarding Point 1 above. Out: 21/2 Email from Siobhan (regarding Point 1 above) forwarded to Lyell. In: 6/3 Email from Siobhan to Margaret advising of the arrival of the hard copy of the EA at Pyramul Hall.	
7.0 General Business Ed provided feedback on the submission that had been received through the Exhibition phase, and outlined the Response to Submissions and Preferred Project Report that was being prepared in response (this will go to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DoPI) in the coming months). The Report will be available on the DoPI and Project websites. Ed would also be happy to provide 2 hard copies to be located again in Pyramul Hall, once the report has been	ACTION: Ed to provide 2 hard copies of the RtS and PPR Report once finalised.

finalised.

The key areas raised in submissions were traffic and transport and noise.

Noise:

Further noise monitoring has been undertaken by DoPI, the original noise consultant (Sonus Pty Ltd) and the EPA. The EPA undertook monitoring in preparing for the regulatory change regarding wind farm noise compliance. The results from these additional assessments have not yet been finalised, but will be provided to the DoPI once analysed.

Traffic and Transport:

In response to the weight of submissions regarding the transport routes to the site, and taking into consideration Mid-Western Regional Council's submission, which identified Aarons Pass Road as an alternative oversize/overmass (OS/OM) route option, further assessments have been undertaken.

WPCWP contracted Downer and Rex J Andrews, companies that have experience transporting and building wind farms and wind farm components, to look at OS/OM routes to the site. As a result of this, Aarons Pass Rd was identified as a feasible option for transporting wind turbine components.

This survey identified a number of upgrades (and passing bays) that would be required along Aarons Pass Rd. These upgrades include widening the road to 6m where required, levelling a few crests, straightening some corners, passing bays and laying gravel. There is no intention to seal Aarons Pass Road. There is no need or requirement to do so. Once technical feasibility was confirmed, we subsequently revisited the Traffic and Transport Assessment, and undertook additional Ecology and Heritage assessments related to impacts and upgrades identified.

These assessments will feed into the response to submissions and preferred project report (the Report).

A meeting was held with Mid-Western Regional Council (Catherine Van Laeren and Warwick Bennett, the General Manager) to discuss these changes.

As well as the use of Aarons Pass Rd, OS/OM transport routes are proposed through Mudgee. A primary route (using the highway route) and two secondary routes as options for over length vehicles (greater than 50 m) were discussed with Council. Council raised concerns regarding Ulan Rd, and Ed acknowledged those concerns. A lot more detail regarding these routes will come through in the Report.

Crudine Rd: Concern was raised regarding the use of Crudine Rd (by Lyell), including the fact that once construction starts, it will be impossible to restrict use of the road. Ed confirmed that there is no intention to use Crudine Rd except for the northern section which may be used for limited access to the transmission line to the north.

Time frame: Karen Croake also commented that there is little incentive for people to use the road considering travel time along it.

Impacts to other roads were also noted (such as the Castlereagh Hwy) , which Ed responded to by referencing back to the construction time frames that are being proposed – 18 months total, 4 months of which are proposed as a “peak” period.

Decommissioning: Would involve about the same amount of traffic, but also limited to the same time frame (about 18 months). A decommissioning and rehabilitation plan will be in place before decommissioning commences.

Reason for proposed alternate routes: The alternate routes are a result of responses to submissions. Not simply the objections, many submissions were constructive, including MWRC’s suggestion of Aarons Pass Rd. Margaret noted that Changes such as this are part of the process of community consultation, and demonstrate the exhibition / response to submissions / preferred project report system is working. Change as come about in response to public/agency comment.

Consultation: Occurred along Aarons Pass Rd with all landowners who own land along the road, with Council, at the Mudgee Small Farm Field Days (WPCWP held a stall in the Founders Pavilion) and here at the CCC. Ed noted that anecdotally, he and other staff generally received a very positive response at the field days regarding the proposed routes, including those through Mudgee.

Cost to Council/Involvement of Council: Max asked what WPCWP are expecting Council to spend on Aarons Pass Rd to make it passable. Ed's response was none. Council won't be asked to put any money into the required upgrades. And that has been the line from the very start. MWRC do have a strong view that they should have the contract to upgrade roads, however, normally, the contract would go out to tender. In the end, however, it's their road, and it will be a process of negotiation.

Meeting response to proposed routes: A few concerns were raised about the potential community reaction to the route through Mudgee, and also along Aarons Pass Rd. In particular it was noted that Aarons Pass Rd is of a very low standard.

WTG Layout:

Max Price raised the subject of the 3 WTGs closet to his property boundary (150m), and his request that they be moved. Ed confirmed there was no intention of moving them as they are compliant with all criteria that they are required to be compliant with. The CRWF will be assessed based on merit, by the DoPI, and while papers like the MWRC DCP are required to be considered, they do not need to be adhered to.

Blade throw / Ice throw:

This is discussed in Chapter 18 of the EA. Is assessed in terms of risk and probability of occurrence. The EA process is a scientific merit based assessment. DoPI will be assessing the CRWF against merit based criteria (as well as against consultation etc). There is potential for ice throw, however the blade has an element that registers and corrects for ice build up as required. This is also managed through an offsite system that monitors individual wind turbine performance.

Can you provide scientific evidence that there are no health impacts from WTGs:

Ed confirmed that as a company and through the peak industry body we are continually doing that. WPCWP would be happy to adhere to any regulations that flow through from peak bodies (such as the NHMRC) regarding health, off the back on continuing scientific reviews that say there is no direct causal link between operation wind farms and ill

health.

Anomalies throughout the EA, and in particular in the Noise report (raised by Owain):

Issues raised were consistent with those raised in the Crudine Ridge Environment Protection Group (CREPG) submission. Included issues with the weather monitoring / monitoring locations / ecology assessment / unformed Crown lands / signed declaration of the EA.

Ed responded to numerous individual issues (weather logger cable damage was accounted for, monitoring locations are determined by the noise modelling for the worst case layouts. More broadly, however, each report is the consultant's key area of expertise, and should be judged as such. The EA goes through an adequacy process before going on public exhibition, at which point it is also reviewed by the Department's own noise experts. No significant comments came out of that process for the noise report. Again, lodging the EA is not the end of the process, it is, in fact, iterative, and assessment of the project will continue until approval.

Also, in NSW there are no native title claims on Crown roads. Where a paper/Corn rd flows onto land, the Project needs to retain a right of access. We can either close the road and provide an easement, or undertake a lease or licence for access.

Further to this response, a more detailed response to these questions is provided in the Report. Again, however, it comes down to the fact that it is a merit based assessment of the Project, and it will be assessed on its merits (scientific and as defined in the DGRs).

Owain questioned support for CWRF:

Ed responded that the submissions received need to be understood in context, in particular in the context of broader studies, surveys and assessments which show overwhelming support for wind farms, and the well-coordinated anti movement around the project. This, again was highlighted by the very positive response received at the field days.

Process after the Report is made public?

Ed noted it is for the Department to decide whether or not

<p>to re-exhibit the project EA, generally, however, there isn't another round of submissions.</p> <p>The PAC will occur, however, and there is a role to be played by the public. Submission of a formal written submission to the PAC must be made before you can present to the PAC.</p>	
<p>8.0 Next Meeting</p> <p>Next meeting to be held Monday 21st October, 11am Pyramul Hall.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 12.55pm.</p>	



MINUTES OF MEETING

CRUDINE RIDGE WIND FARM COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CCC)

11:00 am, Monday 9th December 2013
Pyramul Hall
Minutes taken by: Siobhan Isherwood

Attendees:

Margaret MacDonald-Hill	Independent Chair
Ed Mounsey	Wind Prospect CWP (WPCWP)
Siobhan Isherwood	Wind Prospect CWP
Lyell Miller	Community representative
Vera Tomlinson	Community representative
Max Price	Community representative
Owain Rowland-Jones	Community representative
Alan Heath	Community representative
Karen Croake	Community representative
Esme Martens	Community representative
Catherine Van Laeren	Group Manager, Development and Services, Mid-Western Regional Council
Richard Denyer	Manager - Development Assessment, Bathurst Regional Council
Judy Rowland-Jones	Observer

Apologies:

John Weatherley
Lisa Andrews
David Shaw

ITEM	ACTIONS
1.0 Welcome and Introductions 11:05am – Meeting Opened Margaret MacDonald-Hill, Independent Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Introduced Richard Denyer, attending for David Shaw from Bathurst Regional Council.	
2.0 Apologies John Weatherley, Lisa Andrews and David Shaw.	
3.0 Declaration of Interest Margaret MacDonald-Hill declared her interest as Independent Chair of the CCC, engaged by Wind Prospect CWP. She is also a Member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Ministers' Arbitration Panel.	

<p>Margaret also noted that she was attending in Lisa Andrew's place, as Lisa was unable to attend due to family circumstances. Lisa will chair meetings from now on in.</p>	
<p>4.0 Confirmation of Minutes</p> <p>Draft minutes from Meeting 2: 15th July, 2013 were accepted.</p> <p>Moved: Vera Tomlinson</p> <p>Seconded: Max Price</p>	
<p>5.0 Business Arising</p> <p>Two copies of RtS and PPR report were provided for community use at Pyramul Hall. This was undertaken at the same time the report was submitted to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.</p>	
<p>6.0 Correspondence</p> <p>In:</p> <p>26/7/13 Email from Warwick Bennett, General Manager MWRC regarding comments made during Meeting 2 on Aarons Pass Road – tabled.</p> <p>Out:</p> <p>26/7/13 Two emails from Margaret to Warwick Bennett regarding the matter, and providing information from the draft minutes – tabled.</p> <p>13/12/13 Email from Margaret notifying members of the reports at Pyramul Hall.</p>	
<p>7.0 Project Update / Discussion</p> <p>Ed summarised progress with the project since the last meeting. This included describing the final transport routes being proposed for over-dimensional vehicles, and the general content of the Response to Submission and Preferred Project Report (the Report).</p> <p>A draft version of the Report was submitted to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DoPI) and passed along to relevant agencies. WPCWP received feedback from a number of agencies, including the RMS and MWRC.</p> <p>In response to feedback received, the Report was redrafted. This included proposing an alternate transport route through Gulgong,</p>	

in response to a request from MWRC and use of Ulan Road was scrapped. Although use of Ulan Road was technically feasible, WPCWP acknowledge a certain level of concern about the existing use of this route.

Regarding use of Aarons Pass Road (APR), Ed noted that he had never stated this as MWRC's preferred route. Moreover, that he had referred to it as an alternative route MWRC had included in their submission to the EA.

Three committee members disagreed, saying they had heard Ed refer to it as Council's preferred route.

Traffic and Transport:

Over-dimensional vehicles: Ed revisited the process by which the proposed routes were arrived at. Technical and environmental assessments of APR identified that it was a suitable route with recommended upgrades.

So, suitable routes to access APR were investigated. This process led to using road through Mudgee. The RMS route will be used for all components except blades. This includes vehicles returning empty.

Route 2, using local roads, would only be used for blades, with a maximum of 2 vehicles per day carrying blades.

Over-dimensional vehicles returning empty will use the same routes; APR and Castlereagh Hwy, and will not use Pyramul / Windeyer Roads.

Standard Heavy Vehicles (SHVs): Routes identified and proposed offer opportunities from the north and the south. Routes include use of Sofala Ilford Road, Ilford Road from the south and Aarons Pass Road where required.

Sallys Flat Road will not be used for SHVs. Only light vehicles proposed for this route.

A section of Hill End Road will be used to gain access to the southern site access point. This section does run past Monkey Hill.

Pyramul Road will not be used for SHVs.

Questions regarding Transport Routes:

What sort of speeds will vehicles be adhering to?

There are strict limits that are applied to ensure safety on roads. Along the Castlereagh Highway, would likely pick up speed to around 70 or 80kph, but on APR, much slower to ensure safety. Speed limits will be defined by loads, and outlined in the CEMP.

What would the time separation between loads be through the day?

That hasn't been defined at this stage, and likely wouldn't be until we know the number and type of turbines being used.

There are a number of finer details that won't be defined until we know the number and type of turbines that will be used. What we are committing to, though, and approval conditions will reflect this, is that there will be a number of activities we will be required to undertake. Including notification of the traffic schedule. Perhaps printed in newspapers or as a leaflet.

Oversize loads are usually moved at night.

Yes, they will be moved out of Newcastle overnight. However, we moved from a position of overnight movements through Mudjee, off the back of a discussion with Council.

Will vehicle movement be restricted in the same way mining vehicles are?

Yes, and pilot and escort vehicles will be used for over-dimensional vehicles (don't know the distance between these vehicles and the over-dimensional vehicle they are supporting, though).

Margaret noted that with some mining traffic, police escorts are used, and they strictly manage other traffic on the road around over-dimensional vehicles.

What will the delay along APR be for local road users?

Unsure at this stage, as noted, speeds are variable even now, it is likely this will be the case for project traffic as well. Ed said he could take the question on notice, and provide further information, possible estimates.

Will signage be used?

Yes, this is something the RMS raised, Variable Messaging Signs for line of sight on the turnoff onto APR.

Will all the passing bays identified be used?

ACTION: Ed Mounsey to seek further information on potential delays along APR.

<p>Probably not, they will be used as necessary / strategically.</p> <p><i>How long will road upgrades take – how many months?</i> We can't provide that information right now, as it depends on the standard of road upgrades required. This is still a contentious issue between us and MWRC, and outcomes of this will play a role in determining length of time to upgrade the road.</p> <p><i>Costing for APR is significantly insufficient – very low standard, getting stuck behind traffic is a problem</i> Yes, we understand that concern, The figure quoted is only an estimate. However, passing bays are also proposed to alleviate some delays.</p> <p><i>Has shadow flicker through trees along APR been considered?</i> This is a consideration along many rural roads, and will be considered in drafting the CEMP.</p> <p>Richard Denyer noted that there are standard models that can be used to deal with such problems.</p> <p><i>Could towers be sourced from down south?</i> At this stage, it's unlikely as the last tower manufacturer closed down about 6 – 9 months ago.</p> <p><i>What will happen with wood produced from trees being removed along APR?</i> Not sure at this stage, the most likely scenario would be that it would be chipped and carted away.</p> <p>Suggestions are not to burn on site or lay down to create a fire hazard.</p> <p><i>Will dust suppression be used all the time?</i> Yes, as required. Additives could be used to reduce water demand for dust suppression. This would depend on whether they are permitted substances in both Council areas.</p> <p>Judy Rowland Jones (Observer) made the comment that the traffic numbers in the appendices are confusing and should be re-checked. The discrepancies appear to be between pgs. 39, 62 and 43.</p> <p><u>Onsite batching plant / concrete</u></p> <p>The use of both onsite concrete batching and use of concrete agitators has been considered. Onsite batching is preferred;</p>	<p>ACTION: WPCWP to recheck figures and report back to the meeting.</p>
--	--

however the worst case option of concrete agitators has been assessed. No decision has yet been made as to which scenario will be used.

Water

Discussion was had about where water would be sourced from, and what sort of restrictions are placed on water access and use during construction. The influence of changing climatic conditions (such as drought) on water use and access was also discussed.

Responses from Ed outlined that it is likely dam water will be used, and that other sources, including Windamere Dam are also considered (traffic associated with this process has also been considered). All water use for the project must be reasonable and permissible and is licensed by the NSW Office of Water. Licences have an end date, and adhere to the regulations in place at time licencing.

Ed also provided examples from Boco Rock Wind Farm, currently under construction, for which licences changed at the start of construction because regulations had changed since approval of the project, and existing licences are constantly under review.

MWRC DCP

Setbacks defined in the MWRC DCP 2013 were discussed. It was outlined that these had been considered in the Response to Submissions report. Ed outlined that the DCP had not been considered in the Project EA as a result of timing and this was discussed with the DoPI.

However, it was noted that the project is a State significant development, and as such, the DCP does not apply.

Noise

Three additional locations were monitored for background noise recently, is the information publicly available, and can it be provided to owners of those residents where measurements were taken? (Question from Lyell Miller)

The report is publicly available, on the DoPI website. We understand the technical detail can be difficult to deal with. Ed would be happy to go back through documentation and call Lyell to discuss.

Alan Heath also noted he has not had access to data obtained at

ACTION: Ed Mounsey to follow up on provision on data to Alan Heath and Lyell Miller and discuss results as required.

his residence.

Where were wind speed measurements extrapolated from?

From on-site monitoring masts, the original masts measure wind speeds at 30, 45, 60 and 100m, while more recent masts measure at 40, 60, 80 and 100m height above ground.

Remote monitoring is also used.

Are the SA EPA Noise Guidelines a requirement here?

Yes, the NSW State Government adopted the guidelines, background monitoring was thoroughly undertaken in 2011 to fulfil these requirements.

Environmental Offset Sites

Offset land packages proposed are not sufficient to cover requirements.

There is at least one that WPCWP considers sufficient, and this is proposed as the offset package.

Traffic Estimates

Traffic counts from 2005 are out of date.

These were updated in the PPR, and were also verified by spot counts in 2011.

Community Fund

The Community Fund is very small.

Actually, it is up to something in the order of \$3.3 million. Ed discussed the various ways in which this fund could be managed, including providing examples from Boco Rock Wind Farm. The alternative of a Voluntary Planning Agreement, which is managed by the Councils.

Ed sought input/feedback from the CCC on how they would like to see the managed. Some concern was raised about Council having sole control over the money. The general consensus was that there should be a balance of both community and Council involvement in the management of the Fund. Catherine Van Laeren outlined experiences Council has had with similar funds associated with coal mines in the area. Richard Denyer also commented that community organisations approach fund management committees for funding each year in Bathurst also.

Ed also noted that the financial commitment to upgrading roads to the level required for the project is separate to the Community

<p>Fund.</p> <p><u>WTG Layout:</u></p> <p>Max Price raised the subject of the 3 WTGs closet to his property boundary (150m), and his request that they be moved. Ed confirmed there was no intention of moving them. Margaret suggested issues of compensation should be matters dealt with between the resident and the company.</p> <p><u>Political will for renewable energy</u></p> <p>The original RET was introduced by Ian McFarlane (under the previous Liberal Government), and he's now in a key role again. The renewable energy industry is working closely with him and Greg Hunt to deliver an outcome, and shape the RET. As it is being debated right now, we can't be definitive; however there is a lot of support for the RET. At the end of the day, though, if the RET is removed, the project wouldn't get the required funding, no project would get funding.</p> <p>It is important to note that this isn't the only industry that receives Government support. For example, agriculture and mining both are heavily subsidised. The same situation would apply to those industries.</p> <p><u>Construction commencement</u></p> <p>Construction and operation timelines, if the project is approved, would depend on funding and economics, among other factors.</p>	
<p>8.0 General Business</p> <p>None.</p>	
<p>9.0 Next Meeting</p> <p>Proposed month for the next meeting is March / April, depending on progress on the report. Lisa Andrews (who will chair the meeting) will provide a minimum of 2 weeks notice.</p> <p>Chair wished everyone a happy Christmas and a safe and prosperous new year.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 1pm.</p>	