

Attendees	Initials	Position
Garry West	GW	Independent Chairperson
Heather Gough-Fuller (via Teams)	HGF	Community Representative
Brad Bliss	BB	Community Representative
John Southwell	JS	Community Representative
Pip Smith (via Teams)	PS	Community Representative
Lindsay Hough	LH	Community Representative
John Xuereb	JX	Community Representative
John Goodworth	JG	Community Representative
Matt Flower	MF	CWP Renewables – Development Manager
Jessica Petersen (via Teams)	JP	CWP Renewables – Development Officer

Apologies

None

Item	Details and Actions
1.0 Welcome and Introductions	Meeting opened at 9:09am at WINs and via Teams teleconference
2.0 Apologies	None
3.0 Declarations of Interest	<p>Responsibility of all members to keep declarations of interest updated. GW to share declarations, group to consider and decide what to do.</p> <p>LH declared that he has entered a neighbour agreement with CWP. GW - put to the meeting if they are happy to continue serving on the committee – All happy.</p> <p>JX – declared that he has also entered into a negotiated agreement. All happy for him to remain on committee.</p> <p>GW to provide JX with a declarations of interest form to complete.</p>
4.0 CCC Guidelines	Nothing new
4.0 Minutes of previous meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved by all and uploaded to Uungula Wind Farm website
6.0 Business Arising	<p>Actions from previous meeting: outline the emergency preparedness especially considering bushfire response during construction</p> <p>MF - An Emergency Response Plan will be developed as post approvals, but pre-construction. Too early to prepare it now. It will be a condition of approval before starting construction. RFS NSW will have a review role and DPIE will sign off. Agency consultation is required.</p> <p>UWF understand that the CCC is concerned and clarify that we have commitments as part of the Development Application.</p> <p>MF – note that project roads will aid firefighting efforts significantly.</p> <p>Vibration concerns and explosive use:</p> <p>MF – assessed in the noise and vibration impact assessment. Happy to provide details of where it is discussed in EIS. (Action)</p>

	<p>HGF – question about height of WTGs and photomontages not clear compared to previous photomontages that were provided. MF – We could look at a specific photomontage if you have concerns. HGF – heard concerns from locals that viewpoints don't line up with their properties so they can't see what the impact would be from their dwelling. MF - Viewpoint analysis was undertaken as part of the EIS LVIA and follows the guidelines. We did not do a photomontage from every residence and it is not required in the guidelines. The EIS includes a detailed table of every residence with description of potential impacts.</p> <p>HGF – feedback to me in my area is that the LVIA has not been specific enough. MF – happy to take the questions on board and get in touch with the specific people with concerns HGF – how do you do the assessment if you have said that the WTG size may be smaller than 250m height? MF – assessment was done on a 250m tip height (as the worst case) but if a smaller WTG is chosen the visual impacts would naturally be less. Discussion about approval process for WTG height and other projects requiring modifications to increase tip height as WTG technology has changed over time. Too early to know the exact dimensions of the WTGs that will be selected for this project (will follow tender process). HGF – thank you for answering.</p>
7.0 Correspondence	Electronic copy of Presentation sent to CCC members attending via video prior to the meeting
8.0 Company reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MF provided hardcopies of presentation; JP presented the digital copy via Teams. • Electronic version will be made publicly available on UWF website with minutes.
9.0 Project Update / Discussion	<p>Project update: MF - Since the last meeting UWF team have been focused on the approvals process. Submissions report and Amendment Report have been submitted and accepted by the DPIE who are now assessing the project</p> <p>The last few months we have been in close consultation with roads authorities (TfNSW and DRC) regarding the intersection of TMR and Goolma Road.</p> <p>Submissions Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of submissions • Actions taken during and after exhibition • Submissions responses <p>Amendment report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated environmental assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extensive heritage test excavations ○ Biodiversity including targeted surveys ○ Minor amendments to the bushfire and hydrology report • Changes to the project • Updated project description to reflect changes • Updated statement of commitments <p>Goolma Road / Twelve Mile Road Intersection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large topic over the last few months. Extensive consultation with roads authorities and members of the public • UWF need to work with roads authorities who ultimately make the decision regarding the layout • Roads authorities have decided the alignment should be within the gazetted road, north of the current intersection. (Preliminary plan provided in the presentation.)

- Safer solution agreed by authorities – longer sight distances.
- Will probably be the first thing that the project will have to upgrade prior to construction.

BB – concerns culturally about that area as it has not been surveyed. There were sites in the solar farm and along Twelve Mile Road.

MF - Archaeologists have done a walk over and had a look at that area. CWP Renewables will provide a response from the Archaeologist to BB (Action).

JG - is there going to be a turning lane going out of TMR onto Goolma Road?

MF – Discussed printed preliminary layout plan with group.

LH – Noted the lack of acceleration lane

MF – We have had many discussions with people about this and TfNSW have clarified that it is not warranted or needed for this intersection.

TfNSW have made their decision after extensive consultation between UWF, DRC and the road engineers because they feel that the inclusion of acceleration lane is not safe travelling towards north and due to sight distance turning left is not required. The design is a pretty typical intersection and would have very long sight distances.

Concerns among the group regarding road use and expansion plans for the correctional facility.

GW – taken on board CCC’s concerns that the roads authorities do not appear to be considering other future use (correctional facility expansion) GW to get in touch with TfNSW to alert them of the committee’s concerns. (Action)

JS – Remember that the construction phase is temporary. During operations, UWF would be very minor road use.

MF - If there is a discussion about road network planning, it is out of our project. Fair enough that the committee is concerned about the road network in general and can raise their concerns separately. Also noting that I drove past the intersection and it seems Council may have mown the grass and pegged the area.

Voluntary Planning Agreement:

MF – a VPA is a standard condition for wind farm projects. We anticipate a condition (should the project receive consent) that requires us to enter into a VPA with Council. Therefore we entered discussions with DRC and have landed on an annual payment per year per turbine installed of \$3,309.

MF – the Daily Liberal yesterday incorrectly stated that a VPA had been agreed. To be clear, this VPA is not agreed/signed up yet. Council are now running their standard consultation process to receive public comment on the Draft Agreement.

JP – public can provide their feedback via a form on DRC website <https://www.dubbo.nsw.gov.au/public-exhibition/draft-planning-agreement-uungula-wind-farm>

Open until 20 January 2021. (action)

PS provided the following contact details:

- Michael McMahon - mgm@dubbo.nsw.gov.au
- clrdavid.grant@dubbo.nsw.gov.au
- clranne.jones@dubbo.nsw.gov.au

PS provided the following details regarding the community fund:

Part 3 - Community Benefit Fund Part 3 of the Planning Agreement will be for a Community Benefit Fund, which will be administered by Council’s Solar and Wind Farm Committee. Funds will be available for

projects in the former Dubbo Local Government Area and the former Wellington Local Government Area. Funding Part 3 of the Planning Agreement will cost \$120,000 per annum for the life of the Planning Agreement (25 years).

MF – We have heard from CCC and other community members that the money should be spent in Wellington closer to the project. DRC do not support that. They are looking at a more broad approach rather than having an adhoc number of funds and various committees for all of the renewables projects in the area.

The draft VPA with UWF is broken up into 4 parts with payments allocated by percentage across parts or focus areas.

- Part 1 of the Planning Agreement would run for the first five (5) years of the Planning Agreement and would be for Council to undertake a range of strategic planning projects
- Part 2 of the Planning Agreement would be for the provision of strategic projects throughout the Local Government Area.
- Part 3 of the Planning Agreement will be for a Community Benefit Fund, which will be administered by Council's Solar and Wind Farm Committee.
- Part 4 would contribute to ongoing maintenance of Twelve Mile Road and other minor road (eg. Uungula Rd, Wuuluman Rd, Yarragal Rd, Illgingery Rd). – this would be outside of the project's commitment to upgrade and maintain Twelve Mile Road during construction.

GW - Encourage Wellington residents to make submissions regarding the Draft VPA.

PS – this is a great concern of mine and we need to get this right as a group. PS is on the Bodangora committee which stipulates that community funding must be spent within the 2820 postcode and has worked well so far.

GW – you should make your concerns known to the CEO of DRC. This is not something that CWP can engage with DRC's procedure. Understand where you are coming from and encourage the local community to have their say too.

PS - Understand that MF and JP are doing their job and they are doing a very good job. Expressed disappointment with DRC's new committee and proposed structure, with concern that the funds would not be spent locally.

JG – Q for Pip - has Dugald Saunders been appraised about this?

GW – I send a copy of the approved minutes to Dugald Saunders Electorate Office and the DRC committee.

JX – does the maintenance and upgrade extend past Meath on Twelve Mile Road?

MF – upgrade only goes to the project entry, with maintenance during construction and ongoing during operations. Funding from VPA for road maintenance, I don't think it would be used east of the project but that is not settled yet.

Timeline:

- DRC placed VPA on public exhibition for comment (open until 20 January 2020)
- DPIE assess the project application

<p>10.0 Matters, which Community Representatives wish to raise.</p>	<p>Water: LH – the batching of concrete on site, where is the water drawn for that exercise? MF – water sourcing is incumbent on the EPC contractor awarded. Water will be sourced from licenced sources. LH – concerned about the large amount of water to be used, and the flow on effects to local farmers if a new bore is to be created. MF – water would come from a licenced source, contractors tendering on the project would need to list where they plan to procure water for the project (expect that it would be from existing rather than creating a new bore, but not certain on that yet)</p> <p>Heritage: BB – speaking with Austral Archaeology about heritage sites on TMR were identified on 28/10/2019 and have not yet been registered on AHIMS yet. I can forward you the details and get in touch with AA MF – to follow up with Austral Archaeology. (Action)</p> <p>RFS: MF – is the new RFS shed on TMR progressing? LH – applications for approval have been submitted, including heritage sites etc. Probably finished towards end of 2021. BB – representatives would be on site during construction to ensure heritage items are managed properly in a highly sensitive area.</p> <p>Communications: HGF - I have been asked about potential interference with UHF and communications links. MF – I believe the assessment found no predicted impact on major communications links, but will check about smaller links (Action) LH – firefighting relies heavily on UHF.</p>
<p>11.0 Community Engagement Opportunities</p>	<p>Nil.</p>
<p>12.0 Meeting Dates</p>	<p>Proposed schedule of meetings for 2021 19 February 2021; 21 May 2021; 20 August 2021 and 19 November 2021</p> <p>Probably will get back to face to face meetings in 2021, but will make the call as required closer to the dates.</p>
<p>13.0 General Business</p>	<p>GW - Thank you all, it has been a tough year for everyone. Thank you to MF and JP for accommodating online meetings. Wish you all a Merry Christmas.</p>
<p>14.0 Next Meeting</p>	<p>19 February 2021</p>

Meeting closed at 10:32am.

Action Items:

Item	Issue	Action By:
1	UWF to point towards the EIS section regarding noise and vibration impacts	JP/MF
2	Get in touch with Austral Archaeology regarding AHIMs and provide response to BB.	MF
3	UWF to send details of heritage work at alternative intersection footprint to RAPs	MF

5	<p>Public can provide their feedback via a form on DRC website until 20 January 2021.</p> <p>The draft Planning Agreement and Explanatory Note are available for public comment or feedback by emailing council@dubbo.nsw.gov.au, or completing the submission form at https://www.dubbo.nsw.gov.au/public-exhibition/draft-planning-agreement-uungula-wind-farm</p> <p>Or mailed to:</p> <p>The CEO, Dubbo Regional Council, PO Box 81, Dubbo NSW 2830.</p> <p>For more information please contact Council's Growth Planning branch on (02) 6801 4000.</p>	JP
6	Contact TfNSW regarding potential increased usage of Goolma Rd/Twelve Mile Rd intersection	GW
7	Review impacts to communications links assessment (incl UHF)	MF/JP