



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
<p>1.0 Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>11:07am – Meeting Opened</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>2.0 Apologies</p> <p>Catherine Van Laeren and Alan Heath.</p>	
<p>3.0 Declaration of Interest</p> <p>Margaret MacDonald-Hill declared her interest as</p>	

<p>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>4.0 Role of the Committee</p> <p>As per Meeting 1.</p>	
<p>5.0 Confirmation of Minutes</p> <p>Draft minutes from Meeting 1: 12th February, 2013 are accepted.</p> <p>Moved: Lyell Miller</p> <p>Seconded: Vera Tomlinson</p>	
<p>6.0 Business Arising</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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> <p><u>Mail:</u></p> <p>In: 19/2 from Siobhan to Margaret regarding Point 1 above.</p> <p>Out: 21/2 Email from Siobhan (regarding Point 1 above) forwarded to Lyell.</p> <p>In: 6/3 Email from Siobhan to Margaret advising of the arrival of the hard copy of the EA at Pyramul Hall.</p>	
<p>7.0 General Business</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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</p>	<p>ACTION: Ed to provide 2 hard copies of the RtS and PPR Report once finalised.</p>

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 be 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>	