



**MINUTES OF UUNGULA WIND FARM
COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CCC)**

Friday 12 March 2021, WINs Community Centre, Wellington

Attendees	Initials	Position
Garry West	GW	Independent Chairperson
Heather Gough-Fuller	HGF	Community Representative
Brad Bliss	BB	Community Representative
John Southwell	JS	Community Representative
Lindsay Hough	LH	Community Representative
John Xuereb	JX	Community Representative
John Goodworth	JG	Community Representative
Matt Flower	MF	CWP Renewables – Project Manager
Trish McDonald	TM	CWP Renewables – Project Manager

Apologies	Initials	Position
Pip Smith	PS	Community Representative

Item	Details and Actions
Welcome and Introductions	Meeting opened at 9:33am at WINs GW welcomed the committee and introduced TM who would be taking meeting notes.
1.0 Apologies	Pip Smith
2.0 Declarations of Interest	GW noted and TM confirmed she was an employee of CWP Renewables (CWPR) and had no further interests to declare.
3.0 Minutes of previous meeting	Committee confirmed email receipt of minutes of previous meeting held 27 November 2020. To be uploaded to Uungula Wind Farm (UWF) website. GW thanked MF for also circulating by email the actions from the previous meeting (refer to Item 4.0)
4.0 Business Arising	Actions from previous meeting: 1. Noise and vibration from blasting MF - The standards and criteria for blasting will be included in the consent conditions for the project. Blasting is rare in windfarm construction and depends on the geology and footing requirements. The exact location of the footings for UWF are not known yet, and how many would require blasting is unknown. Blasts are designed by specialist contractors according to a range of parameters including air pressure, rock characteristics and the distance to receivers. The criteria which blasts will be required to meet are designed to be well below that which would cause damage to houses. Explosive will likely not be stored on the site in the case of where few blasts are required but will be brought in by the specialist contractors as required. These and other requirements will be included in a Noise and Vibration Management Plan and there will be communication with the community as to the details of blasting should it be required.

2. Heritages Sites

MF - Austral Archaeology advised that there was a backlog of identified sites for registration and logging within the Aboriginal Heritage Management System (AHIMS). This has now been rectified and the two locations are now on the AHIMS register.

3. Heritage Assessment of Alternative Intersection

MF - Austral Archaeology has advised that the heritage assessment of the alternative intersection location (northern section) has been undertaken, including transects and the likelihood of cultural material.

Summary para sent by MF to CCC prior to meeting:

Heritage work at the alternative intersection was undertaken in accordance with the Code of Practice for the Investigation of Aboriginal objects in NSW, this involved walking transects over the entire area and recording the environmental conditions, disturbances and likelihood of cultural material. Results detailed in a small report prepared by Austral Archaeology included in the Amendment Report, Appendix G, Attachment A. In summary:

Aboriginal and Historic Heritage

To assess the potential impacts upon Aboriginal and historic heritage within the Twelve Mile Road western end realignment and new Goolma Road intersection area, an additional archaeological survey was undertaken on 8 October 2020 by Ricardo Servin (Archaeologist, Austral Archaeology). The survey was undertaken on foot and focused on the paper road section, as well as the two sections of Goolma Road and Twelve Mile Road. Additionally, the land reserve at the intersection between Goolma Road and Twelve Mile Road was surveyed. The surface survey undertaken found no artefacts, and, although visibility and exposure were low due to dense vegetation growth, Austral Archaeology concluded that the landform has low potential for archaeological objects and therefore it is unlikely for artefacts to exist (Attachment A). The Statement of Commitments for Aboriginal and historic heritage outlined in Table 9-1; Section 9.2 of the EIS (ELA 2020) and the updates within the Submissions Report should be applied for the construction works associated with the Twelve Mile Road western end realignment and new Goolma Road intersection.

4. Draft Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA)

MF – Details on how to comment on the draft VPA were circulated after the last meeting.

5. Communications Links Assessment

MF – In addition to UHF communications, Agencies have point to point communications on a more regional scale eg. RFS, Transgrid, Country Energy. As part of the EIS these Agencies have been consulted and the communications assessment checked that the turbine blades do not interfere with these communication links. Regarding car

	<p>communications, there may be interference if directly behind a wind turbine tower, but this would be short term until the car is out of the path of the structure.</p> <p>JS – Noted that moving away from any object interfering with a signal is common sense.</p> <p>JG – Made enquires regarding plans to upgrade mobile reception black spots following information provided by GW. No response to date. How will the project communicate with workers on site if there's an accident?</p> <p>MF – CWPR will have a communications on site and it may include a mobile cellular booster. Location is still to be determined. Site staff and contractors will communicate via UHF radios.</p> <p>HGF – Mobile service is real issue and it will be cumulative as other projects come online. Could CWPR and other companies work together to influence Telstra? MF – will take this on notice (Action).</p> <p>JX – No mobile service along Gollan Rd.</p> <p>JG discussed the new communications systems being implemented in RFS vehicles which is due to 'go live' in the Orana Region within two weeks.</p> <p>GW – If this system relies on mobile coverage the RFS may already be liaising with Telstra for network improvements.</p> <p>BB and LH agreed it is likely RFS would have satellite-based communications.</p> <p>GW thanked MF for answering the previous matters raised.</p> <p>6. Intersection and future projects</p> <p>GW – Liaised with TfNSW and DPIE regarding impact of additional traffic on the proposed Goolma Road / Twelve Mile Road intersection should Corrections NSW expand their facility in the future. Both TfNSW and Dubbo Regional Council (DRC) have no knowledge of a planned expansion. Corrections NSW assess and determine their own developments under Part 5 of the EP&A Act. However, if a future development impacts on a main road, it is subject to the same requirements as developments under Part 4 of the Act, in addition to any relevant Council requirements for local roads.</p> <p>As such, the intersection would be upgraded by Corrections NSW in line with increased traffic associated with any future project.</p>
5.0 Correspondence	Nil.
6.0 Company reports	<p>MF provided a further introduction of TM who will be working on other project and has been with the company for about one month.</p> <p>MF spoke to the presentation tabled:</p> <p>Project Update:</p> <p>CWPR have been responding to requests for information from DPIE, who also visited the site in February 2021 and spoke with some neighbours.</p> <p>HGF – What was the information requested on photo montages, as this was a topic at the last CCC meeting? MF – DPIE requested further</p>

	<p>information on location of the residences and clarification on the visual impact assessment method.</p> <p>LH – Has the number of turbines been determined? MF confirmed the project is seeking approved for up to 97 turbines and the final number to be installed is still to be determined.</p> <p>Approval Status:</p> <p>MF noted the project is now in the 'Assess DA' phase of the approval process and the responses to questions are part of the assessment.</p> <p>Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) update:</p> <p>MF – Discussed the CCC's sentiments with DRC regarding spending VPA proceeds in the Wellington area. Noted that PS made a submission and the exhibition period was extended to 5 February 2021. DRC indicated they will consider the feedback on the VPA before finalising, however they are unable to ring fence any proportion of proceeds specifically for Wellington.</p> <p>GW – Is there an indication that this policy is driven by General Manager or by DRC? MF – No indication either way.</p> <p>The CCC noted that the DRC General Manager is retiring at end March 2021.</p> <p>MF – DRC has a Council-wide VPA process which CWPR is dovetailing with.</p> <p>HGF – Understand there are multiple projects in the area and large contributions involved and agree that strategically-delivered funding will be beneficial for the community. What can be put in place to ensure it is not diverted to capital expenditure?</p> <p>LH noted only two Councillors are from Wellington. The CCC discussed the upcoming election and the likely representation from the area. GW noted the funding distribution comes down to Council and suggested the CCC lobby both Wellington and Dubbo Councillors.</p> <p>MF – A portion of the VPA funds will be directed to strategic project. DRC has advised part of this could be the Wellington Town Plan which has been signed off by Council.</p> <p>The CCC members noted a lack of awareness of the Council's recently adopted the Wellington Town Plan.</p> <p>HGF – The renewable energy companies in the area are well suited to work together to provide additional training for young people in alternative energy supply.</p> <p>MF confirmed that it is not a standard Consent Condition for all State Significant Development projects to have a VPA. For example, solar farms are not typically required to enter into VPA's as part of their consent conditions.</p> <p>Following a question from LH, MF advised that the VPA process for the Sapphire project in Inverell was not based around strategic projects but was more a community benefit fund.</p> <p>MF question to GW – Is a CCC precluded from making decisions on where funding spent? GW – Understands a CCC's role is to make</p>
--	--

	<p>recommendations only, for example Bodangara CCC recommendations are referred to the DRC sub-committee for consideration.</p> <p>JS - Bodangara CCC spent a lot of time making these recommendations and they were largely ignored by DRC.</p> <p>MF – Understand where CCC stands on topic and have conveyed this to DRC.</p> <p>GW – Appreciate MF making these representations and the community now needs to take their issues up with their Councillors for whole region, not just the Wards of Wellington.</p> <p>Timeline and next steps:</p> <p>MF - DPIE are finalising the assessment process. Next steps will be ongoing surveys to assist with the design process, including an aerial contour survey next week (LIDAR fly over).</p> <p>GW – Assuming the project is approved, will there be management plans prepared? MF – Yes, a suite of management plans, eg. noise management plan, need to be developed and approved by DPIE prior to construction (aiming for end 2021). Other actions in time prior to construction would include, as an example, DRC sign off on plans for road upgrades.</p>
7.0 Matters which Community Representatives wish to raise	<p>LH – Will you be contracting out the road upgrades? MF confirmed yes, contractor to be selected after tender.</p> <p>LH – Will you make sure the road is brought back to original upgraded condition? MF confirmed yes, dilapidation assessment will be undertaken after the upgrade, then after construction is finished. There will be requirement to restore the road to the ‘after upgrade’ condition.</p> <p>JG – Do you consider the track record of the construction companies regarding payment to their sub-contractors? MF – Will take this question on notice and respond before the next meeting (Action). It is not only price that is considered, but also items such as quality systems, safety, and the contractor company’s reputation.</p> <p>BB – Care should be taken in awarding earthworks contracts, as there has been destruction of Aboriginal heritage sites at some local projects.</p> <p>MF – Noted other examples of this happening in other States and recognised the issues.</p> <p>JX – There may be protection processes in place but it is the equipment operators that are the issue. MF – Noted.</p>
8.0 Community Engagement Opportunities	Nil.
9.0 General Business	Nil
10.0 Next Meeting	<p>GW – Nominally 3 months, but will consult with MF as to timing. It may be best to wait until there is more information on the project approval. Thank you all for attendance today.</p>

Meeting closed at 10:36am.

Action Items:

Item	Issue	Action By:
1	Further consideration of improvement of mobile service in the vicinity of the project. For example, could CWPR and other companies work together to influence Telstra?	MF (prior to next meeting)
2	In awarding the contract for construction, does CWPR consider the track record of the construction companies regarding payment to their sub-contractors?	MF (prior to next meeting)