

Minutes of Meeting

Rye Park Wind Farm

Community Consultation Committee

Present:	Nic Carmody	Independent Chairman	NC
	Councillor James Wheelwright	Upper Lachlan Shire Council	JW
	Councillor Ann Daniel	Yass Valley Council	AD
	Greg Medway	Involved landowner	GM
	Malcolm Day	Involved landowner	MD
	Joyce Day	Involved landowner	JD
	Graeme Privett	Involved landowner	GP
	Bev Davis	Uninvolved landowner	BD
	Jayne Apps	Uninvolved landowner	JA
	Rontheo Van Zyl	Proponent (TrustPower)	RVZ
	Brian Hall	Proponent (Epuron)	BH
Apologies:	Mayor Wendy Tuckerman	Boorowa Council	WT
	Jenny and Chris Hally	Uninvolved landowners	JCH
	Alex Davis	Uninvolved landowner	AD1
	Chris Mackenzie-Davey	OEH (observer)	CMD
Date:	30 April 2014		
Venue:	Soldiers Memorial Hall, Comur Street, Yass		
Purpose:	Meeting No 7		

Minutes:

Item	Agenda / Comment / Discussion	Action
1	<p>NC opened the Community Consultation Committee (CCC) meeting at 12.10pm.</p> <p>Copies of the meeting agenda and minutes of the previous meeting were distributed to members prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Apologies were accepted from the following members who were not able to attend the meeting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mayor Wendy Tuckerman – Boorowa Council. ➤ Alex Davis - Uninvolved landowner. ➤ Jenny and Chris Hally – Uninvolved landowners (The Hally's arranged for Jayne Apps to attend the meeting in their absence). ➤ Chris Mackenzie-Davey – OEH (Observer). <p>There were no conflicts of interest declared by those present.</p>	Noted
2	<p>NC asked all members present to confirm they had received minutes of the previous meeting and asked if there were any changes.</p> <p>As there were no changes proposed from those present NC moved that the minutes be accepted.</p> <p>The minutes of meeting 6 were accepted by all members present.</p> <p>NC asked that a copy of the minutes be uploaded to the Epuron website.</p>	Noted BH
3	<p>BH and NC welcomed Councillor Ann Daniel from Yass Valley Council as the replacement for Councillor David Needham.</p>	Noted
4	<p>BH ran through the Epuron action items arising from the last meeting;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minor change to the tenth bullet point under item 6b of the minutes of meeting 5. 2. Request for Epuron to run an EOI process prior to construction for local contractors and suppliers. 3. Epuron to circulate any further feedback regarding the establishment of a community enhancement fund. 4. Epuron to provide an estimate of the number of houses and land hectares in bands of 0-2km, 2-4km and 4-6km ranging out from the site. These figures will assist the CCC with community enhancement fund discussions. 	Completed Noted Noted Completed

	5. Epuron to contact V&C Walters.	Completed
	6. Epuron to upload CCC presentation to website.	Completed
	7. Epuron to arrange CCC meeting when exhibition dates known.	Completed
5	<p>BH presented and discussed current project information including development status and key activity since the last meeting. The presentation consisted of 17 PowerPoint slides and a colour copy was provided to each member present at the meeting and will be uploaded to the website after the meeting. Key comments, questions, actions and feedback points arising from the presentation, listed in no particular order, include;</p> <p>a. Tree removal. Following RVZs discussion about the proposed construction EOI process JA asked that the removal of trees be approved. NC mentioned some roadside trees that are removed may need to be chipped and left on the ground for replenishment of the local environment (RMS requirement). BH advised approval for tree removal and vegetation clearance is addressed in the environmental assessment and plans would be further refined once permit conditions were known.</p> <p>b. House numbers. NC advised the house numbers presented on slide 5 would help the CCC to better understand how many residences/properties are potentially affected when considering the allocation of proposed community enhancement funding. AD asked if compensation will be paid to landowners up to 2km from the wind farm. BH said separate compensation payments will not be paid and the development of the wind farm is designed to comply with the relevant planning regulations/standards for amenity issues such as noise and shadow flicker etc. Development of the wind farm also complies with the governments Draft Wind Farm Guidelines. On balance, however, it is possible for some community enhancement funding to be allocated to landowner projects in these bands.</p> <p>c. Turbine micro-siting. JW asked how turbine micro-siting will be managed at Rye Park given recent siting issues that have surfaced during construction of the Gullen wind farm. Apparently some turbines constructed at Gullen have been installed outside the approved micro-siting provisions contained in the permit approval. BH advised that micro-siting at Rye Park will be managed on a project corridor basis (subject to approval) and is set out in the environmental assessment. This approach would enable turbines to be sited within the approved project corridor with design checks to confirm compliance where required.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
6	A general discussion was held around the proposed establishment of a community enhancement funding program for the project. The discussion mainly centred on what type and value of funding support may be required from the project and how best to administer such a fund if established. Key	Noted

	<p>points discussed and general views expressed by those present include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Epuron presentation slides 12 and 13 provided general information, for discussion purposes only, regarding the establishment of a community enhancement fund. ➤ RVZ outlined Trustpowers general approach to the establishment of community enhancement funding programs for their other AU/NZ wind farm projects. RVZ also discussed general details about the funding program established for their Snowtown wind farm in SA. Key points discussed by RVZ include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The values of wind farm community enhancement funds established in SA appear to be lower than other states as the proponents also contribute significant amounts towards the payment of council rates in SA. ○ Wind farms in NSW do not pay council rates but appear to have higher value community enhancement funds compared to SA. ○ The community enhancement funding program established at the Snowtown wind farm in SA is in the order of \$50k per annum in addition to the payment of council rates which are also in the order of \$50k per annum (total approx. \$100k per annum). ○ At this stage it is not considered likely, or viable, that the Rye Park project can support a community enhancement funding program beyond \$100-150k per annum. ○ Any community enhancement fund established at Rye Park will not allocate funding for construction upgrades and repairs to local roads as this is managed separately in consultation with the local councils. ○ RVZ offered to provide further details around how the Snowtown program operates at the next meeting. ➤ Some members asked if funding could be made available to those landowners living within 2km of the wind farm. RVZ advised this option is a possibility but would divert some of the available funding away from other parts of the community as the available quantum of overall funding is capped annually. ➤ Based on experience from other projects JW stated his preference to have the councils heavily involved in the administration and allocation of the proposed funding program so that the community isn't left with unwanted and expensive white elephant projects in the future. ➤ GM reiterated a desire to use funding for next generation projects that will create modern style jobs (such as computing/IT) for younger people and to help keep families living in the area. The community needs to think about the long term big picture issues and not simply build another new playground or sporting facility. ➤ AD believes it is difficult for the CCC to plan for projects at this stage as the quantum of available funds is not yet known. In any event available funding should be allocated to long term community projects (such as education) as councils are already good at providing local facilities such as playgrounds. 	RVZ and BH
--	---	------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Members generally discussed their views around what they feel the quantum of community enhancement funding should be, as provided by the project, if established. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JW advised the Gullen wind farm was initially required to provide around ~\$1,500 per turbine annually but believed it had recently been amended to ~\$1,500 per megawatt annually. JW advised the overall annual contribution may be in the range of \$300-400k per annum. JW will check details and advise at the next meeting. ○ RVZ advised the Gullen figures provided by JW above are at the high end and may be unviable for the Rye Park project to proceed at that level of funding. ○ NC put forward a suggested figure of 1% of turbine revenue per annum. Based on a large scale turbine this would equate to a CEF payment of approximately \$10k per turbine per annum. RVZ also advised this is very high and not viable. ○ RVZ advised that regardless of the method adopted to calculate the quantum of funding it needs to be viable and sustainable otherwise the project will never proceed. In addition to funding the community will benefit from other opportunities such as increased employment and expenditure in the local area. The project will also assist to attract families to remain in the area. ○ RVZ reiterated his view that at this stage project funding is likely to be in the range of \$100-\$150k per annum (maximum) and will be negotiated prior to the commencement of construction once planning conditions are known. ➤ JA commented that she is concerned and offended by the discussion about community enhancement funding as it implies money solves impacts that neighbours will potentially have to live with during the wind farms operations. JA believes local land values will drop and families will move away from the area. ➤ GP and MD believe the project will be good for everyone living in the local area and increased job opportunities and expenditure in local towns will ultimately flow on to the benefit of the whole community. ➤ AD asked RVZ to provide the CCC with a case study about the funding model in operation for Snowtown wind farm at the next meeting. ➤ NC asked if an electricity rebate system is possible for local consumers. RVZ advised this idea is possible but has proven to be very complicated to implement on other projects. This idea is complex and is not a preferred option for Rye Park. RVZ can discuss this idea further at the next meeting and reminded all that paying for these types of commitments all comes out of the same pot of funds. ➤ NC closed the discussion by saying that the overall community benefits will/should outweigh any impacts from the wind farm through the creation of jobs and more money available to spend in the local area. 	<p>JW</p> <p>RVZ and BH</p> <p>RVZ and BH</p>
7	General Business / Other Matters	

	<p>a. BH reminded all about the opportunity to make a submission to the RET review underway by the commonwealth.</p> <p>b. BH to send AD a copy of the recent report (today) released by the CEC about RET modelling forecasts.</p> <p>c. NC mentioned an uninvolved landowner would like to attend the next meeting to discuss potential impacts to their property that neighbours the wind farm.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>BH</p> <p>BH and NC</p>
8	<p>Next meeting.</p> <p>Date: TBC – (aiming for Tuesday 16 September)</p> <p>Time: TBC – (aiming for 12.00pm to 2.30pm)</p> <p>Venue: TBC – (Yass)</p> <p>BH to circulate confirmation of the proposed next meeting date and venue etc. when details are known.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>BH</p>
9	NC closed the meeting at 2.12pm	Noted