

11:00am, Thursday 5th March 2015
Pyramul Hall

Attendees	Initials	Position
Lyell Miller	LM	Community Representative
Max Price	MP	Community Representative
Owain Rowland-Jones	ORJ	Community Representative
Alan Heath	AH	Community Representative
Karen Croake (arrived 11:11am)	KC	Community Representative
Judy Rowland-Jones	JRJ	Community Representative
Vera Tomlinson	VT	Community Representative
Esme Martens	EsM	Community Representative
Liz Densley	LD	Representing Mid-Western Regional Council
Malcolm Healey	MH	Observer
Lisa Andrews	LA	Independent Chair
Ed Mounsey	EM	CWP Renewables
Siobhan Isherwood	SI	CWP Renewables
Apologies		
John Weatherley		Mid Western Regional Council
Catherine van Laeren	CvL	Mid Western Regional Council
Absent		
David Shaw or Janet Bingham		Bathurst Regional Council

Item	Details and Actions
1.0 Welcome and Introductions <i>Meeting opened at 11:00am.</i> Lisa Andrews welcomed the attendees and asked that those present complete the Attendance Sheet.	
2.0 Apologies	As above
3.0 Declarations of Interest	Lisa Andrews declared her interest as Independent Chair, engaged by CWPR.
4.0 Confirmation of previous minutes	Motion: That the draft minutes be accepted. Moved ORJ Seconded JRJ Accepted

5.0 Business arising

Action Items from previous minutes

Item	Issue
1	EM to provide link to Radio National piece, and provide information on electricity bill breakdown.
2	EM to provide photos of transport of tower sections.
3	LA to send link to website.
4	EM to provide link to RET review site.
5	LA to provide hard copies of relevant documents to Committee members.
6	LA to write to both councils.

1. Link added to minutes
2. Provided with minutes
3. Link added to minutes
4. Link added to minutes
5. See correspondence
6. See correspondence

6.0 Correspondence

- 3/5/14: Nomination form sent to Judith to formalise her position on the CCC.
- 21/5/14: Letter to Bathurst Regional Council seeking an alternate representative on the CCC.
- 21/5/14: Letter to Mid Western Regional Council seeking an alternate representative on the CCC.
- 23/5/14: Letters to Max & Vera enclosing draft minutes from April meeting.
- 16/6/14: Response from Midwestern Regional Council that Catherine will remain the only delegate to this committee.
- 4/7/14: Response from Bathurst Regional Council advising that Janet Bingham will be the alternate delegate.
- 7/7/14: Facsimile from Judith, with her application form.
- 16/7/14: Email to CCC members postponing the proposed July meeting.
- 21/7/14: Letters to Max & Vera postponing the proposed July meeting.
- 3/11/14: Letters to Max & Vera with a project update explaining delays.
- 2/12/14: Email to CCC members with copies of correspondence to and from both Council's in relation to seeking alternate representatives.
- 2/12/14: Letters to Max & Vera with copies of responses from both Councils.
- 19/2/15: Email to CCC members with proposed date for CCC Meeting.
- 21/2/15: Letters to Max & Vera with copies of Ed's email and relocation map.
- 25/2/15: Meeting notice and agenda for this meeting.
- 1/3/15: Email and application form from Malcolm Healey for membership on this CCC.

Moved Lisa Andrews

Seconded Lyell Miller

Accepted

<p>7.0 Membership Consideration</p>	<p>LA: Malcolm Healey applied for a position on the committee. The information contained on MH's nomination form was read out for the information and consideration of the committee. LA read the section within the draft Guidelines for Establishing and Operating Community Consultative Committees.</p> <p>Motion: That MH joins the committee as a Community Representative. Moved Lisa Andrews Seconded Alan Heath Passed</p> <p>LM advised that while not moving out of the area, he is moving from his current property, and as such intends to resign from the committee. LM also noted that more community members should be involved in the consultation process. AH adds that as community representatives, existing members should be passing on information and connecting people with the committee.</p> <p>LA: Sorry to see LM go, and thanked him for his time on the committee.</p>
<p>8.0 Project Update / Discussion</p>	<p>EM outlines that there has been ongoing discussions between the planning department and CWP, resulting in draft conditions of approval (draft CoA). CWP has worked with Department to resolve both specific and general concerns, especially with respect to visual concerns, resulting in a reduction in the number of WTGs.</p> <p>A significant reduction in WTGs across the project, but also specifically from the south western end of the Project in response to concerns from residents in that area.</p> <p>The Department are now finalising their recommendation to approve and draft CoA for the Planning Assessment Commission (PAC). They will provide those documents to the PAC in the coming weeks.</p> <p>PAC will then be responsible to bring themselves up to speed on the project, hear from community representatives, hold a meeting, and finalise their decision. Its decision could be: approval, objection or approval with amended conditions.</p> <p><i>EsM queried whether an agreement between Council and CWP has been reached. MWRC had a number of objections to the draft CoA that still have not been resolved.</i></p> <p>EM noted that the Department's recommendations and draft CoA went to agencies including MWRC in January. MWRC provided a response, which has been received by the Department along with other feedback, which will be evaluated.</p> <p>EM also noted that MWRC's response was largely consistent with previous responses, with respect to MWRC wanting full road upgrades,</p>

	<p>microclimate, firefighting, noise, rehabilitation, a VPA, and adequacy of the EA.</p> <p>CWP's position is also unchanged with respect to those issues, and it is up to the Department to consider MWRC's submission in relation to the draft CoA.</p> <p>LA notes that the Department will consider all feedback, and amend draft CoA where relevant. LD and EsM said the letter from MWRC to Dept can be made public.</p> <p>ACTION: LD to provide LA with a pdf of the MWRC letter.</p> <p>EM advised that he had met with MWRC's General Manager (GM), Brad Cam, that morning and indicated that the GM requested CWP to provide Council with an updated presentation at some point in the future.</p> <p><i>JRJ asks if the State Government can override the Council on approving the project.</i> EM confirmed that they can.</p> <p>LA adds that there are a number of State environment policies that override Council planning instruments.</p> <p><i>AH expressed concern regarding the 300 letters Council sent to residents regarding truck movements.</i> Other members added that residents had a right to know the facts.</p>
<p>9.0 General Business</p>	<p><i>MP raised concern with the incorrect information provided to VT & himself regarding the starting time for the CCC meeting.</i> LA apologised for the mix up between mailed and emailed meeting notices.</p> <p><i>MP: TV reception at Goulburn has been affected. What would happen on that issue here?</i></p> <p>EM: Can speak to Taralga, because CWP have taken over management of that site. Responding to community feedback, CWP has installed digital set-top boxes deployed to every affected house on behalf of the project owners.</p> <p>At CRWF the project accommodates the point to point communication links, so it will not be an issue. This is the way the projects have been designed. At Taralga this hadn't been undertaken.</p> <p><i>ORJ: Is it also affecting mobile and internet?</i> EM advised that it is not.</p> <p><i>MP: Will our electricity bills be more expensive or cheaper with WFs?</i></p> <p>EM: Responded that energy generation is made from coal, gas, wind, hydro and solar. Coal fired power is getting more expensive as the</p>

facilities get older. The long term future and low cost generation from coal is reliant on cost of maintenance, and subsidies of coal.

Gas is becoming abundant, and with export, our cost of gas will be linked to export priced, so gas will become an expensive form of generation.

New renewables have the opportunity to displace high cost gas, so the RET should offset cost hikes in other generation and new renewables will suppress cost rises.

Vast majority of cost hikes in gold plating of poles and wires – to raise the bar on the asset.

JRJ: Gold plating was intended for renewables? EM - No, not at all.

MP: Does inaudible sound cause epileptic fits?

EM: I would put that question to NSW Health and NHMRC, I suggest you have a look at its website and also look at the recent report highlighting the \$680 million health cost from coal dust.

MP: do you need coal fired power to back up WF?

EM: Not really, things are progressing / changing all the time. Storage technologies coming a long way. And it's getting easier to model generation.

MP: Minister Hazzard declared that the project would move from Part 3A to State Significant Development (SSD). What does this mean?

EM: As advised at the last meeting, the project was set up for critical infrastructure. The minister has introduced the PAC process and appeal rights where were previously unavailable.

ORJ: Who made the decision to reduce the turbines? EM advised that it was a combination of the Department and CWP's.

ORJ: Thinned for visual concerns and proximity to some properties, roughly 2:1 southern to northern end of removal. But they weren't thinned at northern end, like southern. We still have a big visual impact.

EM: Turbine thinning occurred across the project, and the Department agreed to the changes. Considering proximity, some of the turbines that remain are still within 3km of some receptors that have complained. CWP are putting forward its position that we think it is reasonable /acceptable, and we have to recognise that some people have a different opinion of the project. At the end of the day, it is a merit based process. CWP are balancing issues at a social, environmental and an economic level.

MP: How do the hosts feel about cutting it back?

AH: I'm a host, but also a neighbour to Heather George, so it's a balance for us also.

KC: Were photos taken from ORJ's property?

ORJ: Yes, but the montage is wildly inaccurate. DoPE has been out and had a look themselves. Original photographer took photos from a bad location.

ORJ: Is Ed pre-empting the DOPE's position? It came across that EM said the Department were recommending approval.

EM: I'm not a mouthpiece for the Department, I'm simply passing on what I've been told. It can always change its position. We were given draft conditions for the project, so I am informing the CCC of the information that I have been provided.

LA: The committee agreed at the last meeting that we would only meet when there was something to discuss or information to be provided to the CCC.

ORJ: Do you have a PPA in place, and is funding dependent on PPA?

EM: No, and yes.

ORJ: Standoff between parties on RET – what influence does this have on the project?

EM: The stand-off is an impediment. We are not totally dependent on the 41,000 GWh figure. The figure is almost secondary, we are totally dependent on certainty, and bi-partisan support. Then, the profile requirement will determine the competitiveness of CRWF.

THE RET and certainty over the RET is the key issue.

At the end of the day, why not have certainty over it now, when it can help offset with increasing gas prices.

LM: Will the size of turbines change in CRWF?

EM: No, they will remain within the range proposed in the Environmental Assessment (EA).

ORJ: Why did it take so long for you to agree to remove the ones so close to MP's boundary? Why did you need a push from the Department?

EM: As said before, the project is sound on every point. MP has been consistent on his position, and those views were being heard by the

	<p>DoPE (and by us). When the DoPE raised visual impact concerns, they allowed us to respond to specific and general affects.</p> <p><i>JRJ: What will determine the actual turbines you chose?</i></p> <p>EM: The market, including price, and the particular turbine that is best suited for the project at that time.</p> <p><i>MP: Why did you take out the whole line in the southern area?</i></p> <p>EM: Because the Hundy's had similar concerns to MP's.</p> <p><i>MH: Does turbine removal affect the community fund?</i></p> <p>EM: Yes, because the community fund is linked to the number of turbines.</p> <p><i>JRJ: Are you still proceeding with Triamble and Uungula?</i></p> <p>EM: Uungula - yes and Triamble - no.</p>
<p>10.0 Next Meeting The date of next meeting will be determined when we have further information to discuss/impart. LA will email and write members at that time.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 12:13pm.</p>	

Action Items:

Item	Issue	Action By:
1	LD to provide LA with a pdf of the MWRC letter for provision to the committee	LD and LA