

Granite Hills Wind Farm

COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE – MEETING 9

- Date/Time:** Wednesday, 14th August 2019, 4.00pm – 6.00pm
- Location:** Royal Arms B&B, Bombala Street, Nimmitabel, NSW, 2631
- Attendees:** Peter Gordon – Chair (PG)
David Williams – Community Representative (DW)
Kitt Bryce – Community Representative (KB)
Maria Linkenbagh – Community Representative (ML)
Shane Quinnell – Project Representative GHWF (SQ)
Sarah Blyton – Cooma Monaro Council
Diana Forrester – Community Liaison Representative (DF)
Elisabeth Picker – Community Liaison Representative (EP)
John Miller – JM Projects – Minutes (JM)
- Apologies:** Will Jardine – Community Representative (WJ)
Debbie Schubert – Community Representative (DS)
Vicki Pollard – Community Representative (VP)
John Cook – Community Representative (JC)
Aiden Dalgliesh Community Representative (AD)
Keith Tull – Bega Valley Shire Council (KT)
- In Attendance:** Mark Reynolds (MR)
Jim Williams (JW)

SUMMARY OF MEETING MINUTES:

1. Welcome and Introduction by the Chair:

PG welcomed all to CCC meeting #9, explained meeting procedures and thanked Diana and Grant Walker for their generous hospitality in making the room available and providing catering.

- Noted presence of JM who will prepare meeting notes.
- Apologies noted as above.

2. Declaration of pecuniary or other interests:

No changes or additions to previous declarations.

3. Business arising from previous minutes:

- PG noted minutes from CCC meeting #8 were agreed out of session following consultation.
- PG advised minutes must be on website within 28 days of the meeting being conducted.

- Agreed most business arising from previous meeting will be discussed during the course of today's meeting.
- Further agreement that items presented on the CCC Q&A list provided by KB will be dealt with in full under General Business following SQ's GHWF Report at Item 4.
- Questions were raised during CCC Meeting #8 about appointment of extra consultative community representatives.

4. GHWF Report:

SQ apologised for need to postpone the meeting from original date due to illness. He provided the following summary in relation to studies and timeframes:

- Expected the Level 2 bird studies will be completed soon.
- There had been specialist visits during spring last year and August this year.
- Information on bird and bat activity on site collected but not finalized by SMEC.
- MR questioned how the current 10-year drought will impact the bird studies.
- SQ advised other studies will be looked at as part of historical evidence to inform the report.
- SQ noted timelines are being pushed back because some studies haven't progressed as expected.
- Expectation that studies will be complete by Q4 2019 or Q1 2020.
- Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is anticipated to be submitted in Q1 2020.
- Concerns expressed at the timeframes set for studies to be complete and the compression of time available for review and comment.
- SQ reiterated previous comments about project timelines being pushed back to ensure review and commentary periods are sufficient and meet statutory and other requirements.
- The period of review will remain at least a month irrespective of when any EIS is lodged.
- SQ advised the proponent want the community to have enough time to comment on studies and look at the documents and will more time over and above statutory timelines for comment.
- SQ advised the turbine layout is still not finalised due to complexity and consideration of all factors.
- DW asked a question concerning indigenous artefacts and turbine placement.
- SQ advised an independent specialist is involved for the placement of turbines and an *unexpected find protocol* would need to be incorporated as part of through the Environmental Management Plan as required;
- Further questions were raised regarding the timelines around the indigenous artefacts studies.
- SQ responded the proponent is reliant on specialists to advise how long studies would take and irrespective, as indicated earlier, will determine when the EIS is lodged should studies be delayed.
- Certain members noted the current timelines did not seem realistic.

5. General Business:

CCC Q&A Questions

As agreed above, PG advised the CCC Q&A questions as presented by KB will be addressed in order to ensure sufficient opportunity for response and discussion. PG did note however a number of matters had been addressed and answered in previous meetings and in the interests of time, the meeting should avoid going back over previous discussions.

KB suggested although a number of matters has been discussed previously, there were still answers that had not been provided or responses that were not clear in order to properly assess project impacts.

The following includes topics and questions asked with responses provided and a precis of any further discussions and CCC input following responses.

Topic 1: Property Valuations
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. How many stakeholders have had valuations done? b. How do you intend to use the valuations from these valuations?</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valuation for one stakeholder at the moment • Valuations on a case-by-case basis as requested based on historical information • Working with valuers to get numbers useful for engagement proved not possible following attempts with numerous industry professionals • Valuations have no tangible benefit for the project or ascertaining the value of neighbor agreements given. •
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions asked about the decline in property values in Crookwell – SQ unable to comment • Noted compensation is not linked to valuations • Advised if property owners wanted to talk about valuations then they just need to get in touch with the project to start a process which is done on a case-by-case basis. • Concerns expressed that satisfactory response still not provided. • Comment made that it is not for CCC to intervene between individuals and the project regarding valuations and is a neighbor matter

Topic 2: Neighbour Agreements
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. When do you intend to have finalised neighbor agreement? b. Is it intended these will be done prior to application submission? c. What is the process if you don't each agreement with a neighbor?</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbour agreements are completely voluntary and not mandated but it is best-practice to implement them • The project aims to put neighbor agreements in place with neighbours whose residence is within 2.7km of turbines • Currently there are four (4) neighbour agreements in place • Agreements will be finalised once turbine layout established • These are voluntary agreements – they are at the discretion of neighbours and the

<p>project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DPE will make the final determination about this project, regardless of whether there is a neighbour program in place but consider any agreements which are or are not in place in its review
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More questions raised about valuations to which SQ advised that all impacts on properties will be assessed on an individual basis in relation to neighbour agreements. The value of properties is not considered in neighbor agreements; the agreements consider value sharing to offset possible impacts such as visual, noise, etc.

<p>3. Legal Advice:</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. Please confirm you will pay for legal advice to be sought by impacted neighbours</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determined by best-practice advice as directed by Wind Farm Commissioner that the project would cover the reasonable legal costs associated in reviewing neighbour agreements, the project would consider requests in this regard. Any other legal costs are up to neighbours
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">

<p>Topic 4: Turbine Layout</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. Update? b. Photo montages?</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As advised earlier, the bird studies will impact on layout therefore still in progress Updated photo montages will not be provided to every neighbour. Updated photo montages will be completed at the discretion of the independent Visual Impact Assessor (VIA) as part of the full Visual Impact Assessment. SQ noted this package would be relevant to nearby neighbours and the community because the VIA consultant has to consider and evaluate all possible viewsheds and provide a detailed report. Further commentary regarding changes to turbine layouts which will be dictated by associated project studies Montages to be done at discretion of the VIA and will be very detailed SQ explained the project is consulting CASA regarding turbine lights and flight paths
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted property owners will need to get timely viewing of montages to enable informed commentary DW expressed his concern that nearby neighbours should receive a copy of a photomontage relevant to their property ML asked if the turbines will have lights on them

Topic 5: Contract Accountability
Questions: No specific questions provided – seeking advice in event of change of project proponent/owner
Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All agreements and approvals are with the project not its shareholders. Conditions on the wind farm including approvals and agreements would remain irrespective of who owns the wind farm.
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none">

Topic 6: Indemnity against illness
Questions: No specific questions provided – general response sought
Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments are made by the DPE and informed by a review of research Complaints have driven the things the Wind Farm Commissioner looks at Noted lots of concerns about health impacts. Earlier government studies confirm there are no health impacts on community from wind farms. There remains widespread debate and studies on certain issues
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> View expressed that indemnity should be provided to protect potentially impacted individuals subject to significant medical/health costs as a result of the establishment of wind farm projects Noted this is matter for governments and the legal system to consider and not for this meeting

Topic 7: Land Clearing
Questions: No specific questions provided – Follow up from previous meeting discussions
Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current estimates that less than 100 acres trees will be cleared remain. Any grassland impacts are being reduced by using existing tracks and non-vegetated areas expected. Final clearing determined by turbine layout Advised again there will be a maximum of 30 turbines
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design of the wind turbines was raised with advice that GHWF is still discussing design with manufacturers Sound impacts were raised although this is addressed in the CCC Report provided. It was advised the native grassland clearing was not considered as part of the tree clearing or the 100 acres.

Topic 8: Proposed Infrastructure Additions:
Questions:

<p>a. Where will a sub-station be located?</p> <p>b. How many kilometres of trenching for cabling?</p> <p>c. How many kilometres of road?</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will only be one sub-station on-site determined by final layout with flat ground needed, away from water courses and away from homes. • Engineering considerations will dictate the location. • In most cases the internal cables will be installed under the site roads to reduce impacts on environment. • Cables for the project contain no harmful substances. • Not able to definitively answer questions until final project siting known.
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further discussion held on environmental footprint of the project as well as loss of visual amenity.

<p>Topic 9: Water Issues</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. Where does the water for concrete come from?</p> <p>b. What hydrology studies are being conducted?</p> <p>c. Impact on affected neighbours advised?</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted this topic had been covered previously • Further information is contained in the CCC report provided • Hydrology and impacts are the scope of an independent water specialist report • Studies will determine water use and will be part of EIS
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant discussion held over the amount of water and concrete required for the project as well as vehicle movements impacting on traffic, roads, etc. • Debate ensued over quantities of materials required for project construction, mainly the amount of concrete needed for turbine platforms.

<p>Topic 10: Phone Communications</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. The process [that] will be adopted to discern the possible negative impact of turbines on phone reception.</p> <p>b. Will you fund construction of a Telstra tower away from the host farms if there is any risk to mobile services?</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This subject has been covered in detail previously • SQ advised the company is committed to mitigation if disruption of phone services is an issue and will be required as part of the interactions with the communications owners • The Conditions of Consent will also outline the mitigation measures required if telecommunication services are disrupted by the project. • The project both through independent specialists and directly is consulting with national providers (eg Telstra) to assess and mitigate potential impacts on the

<p>network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications form a part of the EIS and are being reviewed by an independent specialist.
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DW commented that the neighbours don't want to find out there is a problem later

<p>Topic 11: Gaurock Range Wind Farm</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <p>No specific questions provided – Commentary sought on knowledge/relationship with that project</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No arrangement for/with that project or knowledge of a project by that name •
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About actual name of project and the potential proponent referred to a project about 30km North of GHWF • DW asked if it was the new project from Willy Willy • SQ confirmed the project name for the wind farm owned by Willy Willy is Elysian Wind Farm • AKUO has nothing to do with this project

<p>Topic 12: Powerlines</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. Given the 66 and 120 powerlines near the development are at full capacity b. How do you intend to move the end product?</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is engaged with both the TNSP Essential Energy and independent specialists who confirm there is capacity on the line • Any movement will depend on generation/demand but is constantly being checked by the project
<p>Discussion</p>

<p>Topic 13: Site Visit</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <p>a. When will the CCC be shown the site? b. SMEC attendance c. Individual turbine locations</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For site visit to be useful, need to have final design layout available – agreed • Hope to make it within four weeks of the next CCC meeting so long as layout has been finalised • Agreed that it would useful to have SMEC in attendance • SMEC will attend when they have something they can contribute meaningfully.
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed best times for site visit

Topic 14: Community Engagement
<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Disrespect towards property owners b. Inaccuracy of records c. Lack of F2F visits
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A community stakeholder plan has been implemented with 40 face-to-face meetings undertaken by OPF Consulting in addition to other consultants who worked on the project prior to OPF Consulting’s appointment and directly with Project representatives. • Frustrations being expressed at CCC are not being raised by individuals but not communicated to the project and are therefore difficult to address. The project team welcome any feedback directly to help resolve any issues • Contact details have been provided in the Community Stakeholder Management Plan and on all newsletters
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reported concern over content of F2F meeting • Suggested it is a matter for individuals to make their concerns known • Advised of one community member who has not been consulted in the past nine months. EP confirmed this is not correct. • Advised that some property owners have passed on to CCC members their concerns over a lack of information • A view expressed that a change of approach is needed • CCC members are encouraged to bring issues to the table although there is always opportunity for individuals to engage

Topic 15: Firefighting
<p>Questions:</p> <p>No specific questions provided – focus on impact of turbines on firefighting activities</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been some discussion with CFA/RFS but will be further engagement and feedback sought when turbine layout known. • There will be more constructive discussion closer to final project layout
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCC member discussion with RFS member and local property owners about access and impacts revealed concerns about engagement and consideration for local owners • Concerns expressed about aerial fire-fighting capability impacts from turbines and support for land-owners during outbreak of fire

Topic 16: Property health/Impact accountability
<p>Questions:</p> <p>No specific questions provided</p>
<p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covered under earlier topics – nothing further to add
<p>Discussion:</p>

Community Consultation:

DF provided an update on community consultation in addition to the discussion responding to the CCC Q&A questions (see Topic 14).

GHWF CCC Report

A copy of the GHWF CCC Report was tabled and summarised by SQ. It was noted the report covered matters of water use as discussed earlier. SQ advised type of turbine foundations and quantity of concrete assumptions provided by a manufacturer but may differ based on ground conditions. A report tabled by CCC representative noted that water use on a Queensland project as substantially higher than stated and anticipated.

There was further discussion regarding water movement, concrete batching plants and siting considerations. Concern was reiterated by CCC representative about truck trips associated with construction phase. It was advised a traffic study will be undertaken as part of the EIS and will make assessment of traffic movement and which will be subject of review by DPE.

It was agreed the general concerns of neighbours both nearby and further afield need to be outlined and reported on.

Noise Impacts:

Infrasound issues were discussed and CCC representatives expressed concerns about findings of a number of studies. It was noted that one of the features of living in the Nimmitabel and surrounds was not having to deal with unwanted noise associated with cities as cited in the CCC report.

Advice was offered that the project needs to ensure that it is taking into consideration all concerns.

Response to previous CCC Action item

EP provided an OPF report in response to the CCC action item regarding the top concerns of neighbours. EP also provided information about the National Wind Farm Commissioner's response to complaints and a case study on health.

6. Next Meeting and Close:

The next meeting was tentatively set for **Tuesday, 26th November 2019 (or 19th November)**. There was also consideration for holding the meeting on a Friday close to the date to allow more people to attend by conducting a site visit on the same day or day thereafter pending the availability of the turbine layout.

The meeting closed at 6.09pm.

Action	Person responsible	Timing and completion date	Completed
Relevant consultants – to be invited to present on visual impact study details and results Consideration be given to having heritage consultants present at a CCC meeting	GHWF	SMEC and noise consultants to attend a future meeting - TBA	OUTSTANDING
Confirm a date for the next site visit	Peter Gordon	Next meeting in November 2019	IN PROGRESS
Provide information on how much water will be used per average wind turbine foundation	Shane Quinnel	Completed in August 2019	
Community Engagement Summary of top concerns from nearby neighbours and stakeholders	Elizabeth Picker	Completed in August 2019	
Department of Planning and Environment to be invited to a CCC meeting	Chair	Completed April 2019	YES
Provide a copy of the Infrasound Report to the CCC	Chair	Completed December 2018	YES
Provide an electronic copy of the CSEP	Elizabeth Picker	Completed December 2018	YES
Provide contact details to realtor to provide property valuations	David Williams	N/A	N/A
Compile and provide a list of contacts who would like to receive a hard copy of the CSEP	Will Jardine	To be actioned in December 2018	OUTSTANDING
Provide links to new bird monitoring device	David Williams	To be actioned in December 2018	OUTSTANDING
Provide an electronic version of the Infrasound report to PG	Michaela Samman	1. Report one 2. Report two	YES
Provide a link to the TV documentary	David Williams	1. Link one 2. Link two	YES
Review and prepare answer to smoke/aircraft question	Shane Quinnell	Completed April 2019	YES
Provide answers about carbon footprint offset	Shane Quinnell	Completed April 2019	YES
Provide SQ with a list of BMRG members	Kitt Bryce	To be actioned in December 2018	OUTSTANDING

--	--	--	--