

12:00pm, Tuesday 29th April 2014
Pyramul Hall

Attendees

Lyell Miller	Community Representative
Loreen Price	Community Representative
Owain Rowland-Jones	Community Representative
Alan Heath	Community Representative
Karen Croake	Community Representative
Judy Rowland-Jones	Observer
Leanne Heath	Observer
Lisa Andrews (LA)	Independent Chair
Ed Mounsey	CWP Renewables
Ali Dibben	CWP Renewables
Apologies	
John Weatherley	Bathurst Regional Council
Esme Martens	Community Representative
David Shaw	Bathurst Regional Council
Catherine Van Laeren	Mid-Western Regional Council
Richard Denyer	Bathurst Regional Council

Item	Action
1.0 Welcome and Introductions <i>Meeting opened at 12:10am.</i> Lisa Andrews, Independent Chair welcomed all to the meeting.	
2.0 Apologies As above	
3.0 Declarations of Interest	Lisa Andrews declared her interest as Independent Chair of the CCC, engaged by CWPR.
4.0 Confirmation of previous minutes	Draft minutes from Meeting 3, held 9 December, 2013 were accepted. Moved: Owain Rowland-Jones Seconded: Lyell Miller

<p>5.0 Business arising</p> <p>Action Items from previous meeting have been completed by Ed Mounsey and emailed by LA to CCC :</p> <p>Item 1- To review the figures provided in Appendix 3 Transport Assessment for errors. Action: This has been done. We were unable to find any errors in the transport figures in the report (with particular reference to the 3 pages noted in the minutes). We would be happy to answer any further questions regarding the transport assessment, if anyone would like more information regarding the document.</p> <p>Item 2- To send additional noise monitoring reports to Alan Heath and Lyell Miller Action: A copy of the Sonus report detailing additional monitoring was emailed to both Lyell and Alan.</p> <p>Item 3- To provide additional specific information about traffic impacts along Aarons Pass Rd during construction. Action: We have discussed this with the transport contractors that compiled the route survey report, which will be answered at the next meeting</p> <p>Questions & Responses:</p> <p><i>ORJ sought clarification of Item 3 from EM's email.</i></p> <p>EM – Trucks travelling on Aarons Pass Rd will take up to one hour. One proposal to alleviate this is to make the passing bays longer, which would allow the trucks to pull over and allow traffic to pass by. Pilot vehicles will travel with the trucks at distances which allow time to notify the truck when traffic is building up behind it. 40 passing bays have been assessed, which is approximately one bay every 500m. So, trucks will take up to one hour, but travel time for other traffic will be much shorter and close to usual.</p>	
<p>6.0 Correspondence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23/12/13 – Email from Margaret Macdonald-Hill to CCC members - Minutes of previous meeting • 19/3/14 – Email from Lisa Andrews to CCC members – Proposed meeting date & information from Ed Mounsey concerning action items from previous meeting. • 16/4/14 – Email to CCC members - Meeting Notice & Agenda <p>Correspondence since previous meeting was received.</p>	<p>Moved Lisa Andrews Seconded Lyell Miller <i>Accepted</i></p>
<p>7.0 Project Update / Discussion</p> <p>Ed summarised progress with the project since the last meeting, including interactions with the Department of Planning and Environment (the Department), the current planning pathway for the project and the review of the Renewable Energy Target.</p> <p><u>Preferred Project Report and Assessment</u></p>	

The final Response to Submission and Preferred Project Report (the Report) was lodged with the Department and placed on public exhibition from 29 November 2013. Submissions were received over Christmas and January 2014. Many of the issues raised had been previously addressed, the others were tabulated and a response was provided by letter to the Department.

The Report and responses were accepted by the Department on 13 March 2014. Two people from the Department are currently in town to travel the site and meeting with interested parties, including objectors. This is usual for this type of assessment. They will be putting together their assessment over the next few months.

Change in planning pathway

In March there was a change in planning process for the project. Minister Hazzard declared that the project would move from Part 3A to State Significant Development. Effectively, this change removes the project's Critical Infrastructure status, which has a clear planning pathway and does not allow merit appeals after determination. State Significant Development exposes projects to appeal in the Land & Environment Court if a certain path is taken by the Minister.

The change has been very frustrating, especially as the Minister's case for making the change is that deadlines for the project were not met. This is not the case, and we are still challenging this position.

ORJ – If the Department recommended against the project under SSD, would you challenge the decision?

EM – It would depend on the grounds of the decision.

Review of the Renewable Energy Target (RET)

The policy framework around the project is currently under scrutiny. The Federal Government is reviewing the RET, focussing particularly on the longevity and the makeup of the scheme. There is a process in place for the review panel to accept submissions and also to conduct some modelling on the RET.

Some recently released modelling on the RET by ROAM Consulting shows that the impact of increasing the RET, on domestic prices, is negligible and over time will even decrease prices. In South Australia, data from AEMO, the national market regulator, shows that production from wind farms is already suppressing the wholesale price of electricity.

This is because renewable energy brings the wholesale bid for electricity down to \$0, as there are no fuel costs, which creates competition in the market to supply the balance of energy required to meet demand.

Studies, including a recent piece on Radio National, show that costs have doubled over the last few years, and that the RET contributes only around 3-5% to the average residential electricity bill. The RET and the Carbon Tax

together contribute approximately 13%. It is investment in poles and wires, which is really driving prices, as electricity suppliers are achieving rates of return of around 17.5%.

The piece on Radio National can be found at

<http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/backgroundbriefing/2014-04-27/5406022>

ACT Renewable Energy Feed-in Tariff Scheme

The ACT has announced a renewable energy scheme which is effectively a reverse auction for 200MW of new wind.

Within the broader ACT region there are approximately 17 council areas, and bidding from projects outside the ACT is allowed. The process is separated from both federal and NSW politics, and the aim is to reduce emissions by 40%, and be 90% renewable by 2020.

The scheme is open to all types of renewable projects, including solar, wind, waste and other new technologies. There is a total of ~400MW allocated for wind energy, with the first round capped at 200MW. The focus of the scheme is lowest cost, but other criteria include local investment and community engagement.

LM – I am concerned about the \$40 billion that was available for renewables under the Labor Government, but this government says they will be holding on to that money and not paying for solar or wind.

There are two entities – CEFC and ARENA. The Government has been talking about getting rid of CEFC, but there is legislation in place for CEFC to operate for a specific period of time. CEFC operates like a bank, and the conditions on projects they fund typically match those imposed by commercial banks. Like banks, CEFC seek a return on their investment. It is difficult to see the government creating a significant level of sovereign risk by dissolving CEFC with regard to existing contracts particularly where there is a return on the investment to be gained.

ARENA is a grants body, and their funding is being reduced. ARENA funds unique, off-grid, fringe projects, with a focus on new and emerging technology.

Project Approval

ORJ – If the project is approved, what is the timeframe for the start of works?

If all of the other aspects of the project are lined up, works could start within 12-18 months. The approval will require commencement of works within 5 years. However, if all other boxes were ticked, it would take 12-18 months to get the project ready for financing, assuming that there is a strong RET. We do not yet have a PPA for Crudine – No PPAs are currently being offered by traditional electricity suppliers, pending the RET review. However there are some alternatives being offered by the ACT Feed-in Tariff and non-traditional projects such as Gullen Range's agreement to supply power for the desalination plant.

ACTION: Ed to provide link to Radio National piece, and provide information on electricity bill breakdown.

<p><u>Boco Rock Wind Farm</u></p> <p>Boco Rock Wind Farm is one of our projects and is currently under construction between Cooma and Bombala, a town approximately the same size as Gulgong. Tower sections are currently being transported to site, followed by nacelles and blades within the next few months. There is a roundabout on the route to Boco, similar to the one to be traversed at Mudgee. Works have been undertaken to level the roundabout and re-sign the intersection. The trucks are getting through town quite quickly. The first sections through are the bases (approx 20m long) but for larger sections the rear trailer of the trucks will also be steerable.</p> <p>It might be helpful for members to look at the Boco Rock website, which contains all of the reports and documents for the project. We would also be happy to hear from anyone interested in visiting the project.</p> <p><i>LM – Are the turbines a similar size to Crudine, and how many?</i></p> <p>Yes. The development approval allowed for a tower height of 100m and a blade length up to 52m – the actual turbines will be 80m tower height and 50m blade. At Crudine, the allowance is up to 100m tower height and 60m blade. There are 67 turbines in Boco Rock Stage 1.</p> <p>The link to the Boco Rock Wind Farm website is http://bocorockwindfarm.com.au/</p> <p><u>Blade length selection and noise</u></p> <p>Blade length is largely determined by the wind class of the site. A general rule of thumb is that there will be a larger blade for a lower wind resource site, but it is much more complicated than that.</p> <p>Size and sound also have a complicated relationship, and advances are being made to reduce noise, including things like design changes to the trailing edge on GE turbines. The industry views noise as wasted energy, so efforts are made for constant improvement.</p>	<p>ACTION: Ed to provide photos of transport of tower sections.</p> <p>ACTION: Lisa to send link to website.</p>
<p>8.0 General Business</p> <p><u>Questions regarding previous CWPR comments</u></p> <p><i>ORJ – Will Pyramul Rd be used for standard heavy vehicles?</i></p> <p>No. Ed confirmed that the contents of the previous Minutes reflected the PPR and were correct. The PPR deals with all proposed revisions to the transport route, and the route in the PPR can only be changed by reverting to the Department to seek a modification to the project.</p> <p>Generally referred back to previous Minutes re transport issues.</p> <p><i>ORJ – Has there been any revision to the water requirements?</i></p> <p>This was also dealt with at the last meeting and the response is in the</p>	

previous Minutes was reiterated.

LP – Where will you get it from and what if it is dry?

In a worst case scenario, we will truck it in if we must. In order to access any water we have to go through the NSW Office of Water (NOW). We will need to seek appropriate licences from NOW for our use, and they will decide on that licence before we are able to access or use any water.

ORJ – When will the Department's response to the submissions on the PPR be made available?

The response should be posted on the Department's website, because we have been notified that we are in the assessment phase, although we have not specifically checked. The Department's page is linked from our website. [Note: To clarify, our letter in response to the submissions on the PPR is on the Department's website. The Department's response to our letter and the PPR, was to send us an email and change the status of the project on their website to "Assessment".]

ORJ – Samsa's report in the PPR indicated that heavy vehicle movements would take place over about 4 months, but I made submissions that this had not been properly calculated.

This has been clarified in the our letter in response to the submissions on the PPR. 4 months is the estimated peak period – there is some overlapping with construction which will still be happening on site and the first deliveries occurring. Samsa's evaluation is based on a worst case scenario. There is a response to Owain's submission in the letter to the Department.

LP – Have you reconsidered the turbine which concerns Max Price?

No. This has been dealt with on previous occasions.

JRJ – The ecological study says that koalas are not found in wind farm locations. Were they not there in the first place, or did they leave after the wind farms were built?

Ed stated that he could not vouch for every wind farm in the state. The best way to deal with Judy's concerns may be for her to contact environmental agencies across the states. During design, we try to avoid tree copses which usually means we also avoid koala habitat. This is true of turbine layout, but particularly for road layouts.

Recent papers relating to wind farms and health

Two papers have recently been released by the National Health and Medical Research Council and the Australia Medical Association. The NHMRC found that there was no link between turbines and ill-health, and the AMA said the same. Consistency between all reputable peer-reviewed research is coming through.

ORJ – The NHMRC said that more research is needed. It's not a personal

<p><i>concern, however noise and annoyance can, for some people, become a medical concern.</i></p> <p>Different sounds can annoy different people. When sound is purported to carry ill-health effects, studies show that people who believe in that ill-effect are more likely to suffer from it.</p> <p><i>LA – This is one of the things the Department will take into account when making their assessment.</i></p> <p><i>EM – I propose that, given that Judy is actively participating in meetings, she should be made a member of the Committee.</i></p> <p>All members present voted in favour of Judy Rowland Jones being made a member of the Committee.</p> <p><i>LA – Is there a link where people can make submissions to the RET review?</i></p> <p>Yes, but it is important that submissions specifically respond to the terms of reference for the review. It is likely that general statements which do not directly relate to the terms of reference will not be considered. The link to the RET review website is https://retreview.dpmc.gov.au/online-submissions</p> <p><i>LM – Some Committee members do not have internet access and are not getting all of the information. Is it possible to send hard copies?</i></p> <p>LA - Yes. Hard copies of Minutes etc will be posted, although it will not be possible to provide things like links and some linked information.</p> <p><u>Next project milestone</u></p> <p>The next project milestone will be the recommendation from the Department, followed by the Planning Assessment Commission. No precise timeframe, but this will likely take 2-3 months, so we should know more by the next meeting.</p> <p>The Chair, on behalf of the Committee, will write to the representatives from both Councils requesting that alternates are sent if the representatives are not able to attend.</p> <p>Moved: Lisa Andrews</p> <p>Seconded: Karen Croake</p>	<p>RESOLVED: Judy Rowland-Jones to be made a member of the Committee.</p> <p>ACTION: Ed to provide link to RET review site.</p> <p>ACTION: Lisa to provide hard copies of relevant documents to Committee members.</p> <p>ACTION: Lisa to write to both councils.</p>
<p>9.0 Next Meeting The next meeting will be held on 29 July 2014 at 11:00am at Pyramul Hall.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 1:35pm.</p>	