



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
<p>1.0 Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>11:05am – Meeting Opened</p> <p>Margaret MacDonald-Hill, Independent Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Introduced Richard Denyer, attending for David Shaw from Bathurst Regional Council.</p>	
<p>2.0 Apologies</p> <p>John Weatherley, Lisa Andrews and David Shaw.</p>	
<p>3.0 Declaration of Interest</p> <p>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>	

<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: 26/7/13 Email from Warwick Bennett, General Manager MWRC regarding comments made during Meeting 2 on Aarons Pass Road – tabled.</p> <p>Out: 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 Mudgee, 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>	