

Granite Hills Wind Farm
COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE – MEETING 10

Date/Time	Tuesday, 26 th November 2019, 4.00pm
Location	Nimmitabel Community Hall
Attendees	Peter Gordon – Chair (PG) Sarah Blyton – Cooma Monaro Regional Council (SB) Keith Tull – Bega Valley Shire Council (KT) Kitt Bryce – Community Representative (KB) Maria Linkenbagh – Community Representative (ML) Vickie Pollard – Community Representative (VP) Debbie Shubert - Community Representative (DS) David Williams – Community Representative (DW) Shane Quinnell – Project Representative GHWF (SQ) Elizabeth Picker – Community Liaison Representative (EP) John Miller – JM Projects - Minutes
Apologies	Will Jardine – Community Representative (WJ) Aidan Dalgiesh – Community Representative (AD) Mark Adams – Cooma Monaro Regional Council (MA)
In attendance	Mark Reynolds (MR) Michael Daniel (MD) Lyn Williams (LW) Gail Dalgiesh (GD) Michael Stranger (MS)

SUMMARY OF MEETING MINUTES

1. Welcome and introduction by the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PG welcomed all to Meeting No. 10 of the GHWF CCC and noted apologies as included above. PG introduced Mike Stranger who was in attendance as a colleague working on the project consultations with SQ. PG advised that a reasonable amount of time will be spent today discussing turbine layouts although there will be sufficient time to raise other matters is required.
2. Declaration of pecuniary or other interests
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were no declarations of pecuniary or other interests nor changes to previous declarations.
3. Business arising from previous minutes of CCC Meeting #9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed that matters arising from the minutes of CCC Meeting No. 9, as circulated, would be included within agenda discussions at today's meeting and as such no additional discussion required.
4. Correspondence and issues identified by community or local government
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The matter of Commonwealth review and approvals for the proposed project was raised and it was agreed to pick up Commonwealth issues during the presentation by SQ as it was already covered there.

5. GHWF Report

- SQ tabled a hard copy of his presentation of the GHWF Project Update.
- SQ drew attention of those present to the agenda included within the presentation to ensure all important aspects were able to be discussed and noted the aim was to provide an insightful and informative presentation.
- He further advised he intended to address the agenda sequentially and would try to respond to questions as they arose.

Item 1: Project Update Overview

- Noted numerous positive project updates following ongoing facilitation with community and independent consultants
- Outlined updated Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) pointing out these were the rules which GHWF needed to adhere to in delivering their project proposal. SQ explained it is updated every two years.
- SQ advised that SEARs, both old and new, are already accessible on the website.

Item 2: SEARs Update

- The SEARs are the requirements the project must follow in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which will be provided for State level review of the project to achieve development approval
- Advised that some projects require Federal Government review
- As previously explained, there are certain elements Commonwealth Department requested to be considered in regard to Granite Hills
- Updated SEARs capture Commonwealth Government requirements including analysis of impacts on Commonwealth endangered species
- Another example of an addition to new SEARs included;
 - Haulage routes relating to project delivery
 - KB asked if the turbine route had been determined
 - SQ explained it hasn't been determined yet, but it could be Port Kembla
 - Impacts of loads on routes included
- SEARs now include issues of social and economic assessment
- New SEARS are on the website, CCC members and others are encouraged to visit the website to review the SEARs (old and revised)
- The link to the SEARs on the NSW Government planning website has changed to:
 - <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/9846>

Item 3: Turbine Layout

- SQ advised feedback provided regarding the Wind Turbine Generator (WTG) layout, including from community, specialists, authorities and other stakeholders, resulted in major changes and these were presented to the CCC members at the meeting
- A major project adjustment has been a reduction in WTGs from 32 to 23 as per the turbine layouts provided in the presentation.
- This reduction coincided with community feedback which sought
 - Increasing distance of turbines from houses – noise and visual
 - Improve considerations to Environmental sensitivity – clearing and communication
 - Preference for less turbines
- SQ noted tip heights for turbines would be up to 230m – up from the original 200m
- This was to enable larger single generators to enable the huge reduction of turbines of around 30 percent
- SQ advised part of the reduction was a voluntary commitment by the project proponent to completely avoid the North eastern side of the site because it was considered sensitive and highly vegetated by specialists although it was not mandatory to remove turbines from this area – this shows Akuo’s clear aim to improve the project
- There would be an absolute minimum of 1km or more between turbine locations and neighbours
- SQ advised that despite being larger physically, newer generators typically produce less noise than previous models although this would be subject to noise assessments by independent consultants. Any turbine layout would have to adhere to the NSW governments strict criteria
- KB expressed concern it was inconsistent to suggest bigger turbines would make less noise
- It was also noted that the larger turbines would provide for greater negative visual impact
- KB discussed the level of clearing to accommodate larger turbines and generator(s)
- SQ responded the reduction in turbines reduced clearing requirements significantly especially considering the turbines in the NE required longer roads to get to than other locations and were in wooded areas. SQ said the project team was already reviewing clearing requirements which would be provided in the EIS;
- SQ reiterated the major reduction in WTG is a key improvement with stronger mapping and moving away from sensitive areas and neighbours.
- SQ explained the turbines are now at least 1km from Brown Mountain Tower to ensure communications are not affected
- Further concern expressed at the impact of larger turbines on communications
- SQ advised that telecommunications impacts would form part of the project EIS and are studied by an independent specialist

- DW questioned what radial distance layouts would be able to be provided for community comment
- SQ indicated GHWF could reproduce the project layout onto a topographic map with contours – ACTION ITEM
- SQ responded that the latest WTG layout provided the baseline for further consultation and supporting documentation which is still being prepared and will be provided
- KB questioned where the substation will be constructed
- SQ explained they are currently in discussion with turbine suppliers to gain feedback on best position

- There was further discussion regarding turbine size and impacts and it was noted that CCC members and the community need more montages reflecting changes as well as informing more accurate visual impacts
- KB asked if GHWF is planning to provide photomontages to residents and community
- SQ acknowledged the request and advised Visual Impact Specialists will determine what montages are required for the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)
- Comment was made that without detailed montages residents may have no idea of visual impacts and what might or might not be seen
- KB wanted to know exactly what the CCC can receive in terms of visual impacts
- DW asked that immediate neighbours should be informed about potential visual impacts as a matter of priority with the provision of montages
- SQ acknowledged that the earlier montages were provided to inform neighbours of what the project layout could look like in early stages of the project before more detailed visual work was available and reiterated that further information will be provided through the VIA
- KT explained Bega Council would like a photomontage to capture some of the key viewpoints in their Shire. SQ explained the specialists will use key viewpoints which will be decided on their discretion but would communicate this to the specialist.
- Questions were raised about what constitutes key viewpoints in terms of visual impact. SQ advised CCC members will have opportunity to provide commentary on everything that is sensitive.
- DW expressed the severely impacted neighbours should be given montages
- SQ said it can be considered on a case by case basis but AKUO will use the visual impact statement
- ML suggested that montages as discussed should not be too difficult to produce
- ML asked if there are only six neighbour dwellings on the new map. SQ explained it is a scaled map which does not show all near neighbours as it is zoomed in.

- VP asked if the turbines are higher, will there be more neighbours. SQ explained and said GHWF is refining neighbour considerations.
- KB challenged comments by SQ that reduced numbers of turbines would require less concrete and limit other impacts associated with project infrastructure provision.
- SQ disagreed with KBs arguments on this and noted that there was no way in which reducing 30% of turbines could increase impacts particularly considering that the most impactful turbines which were furthest from each other were removed. Noted all information would be provided in EIS and considered by independent specialists;
- MR suggested there will be an increase in trucks and concrete because of the height increase. SQ explained given the huge reduction in turbine numbers and infrastructure this will not be the case.
- There was further discussion about what might or might not be believed in terms of quantities and impacts.
- SQ concluded this part of the presentation by noting that the project will ultimately need to stay within the constraints of DPE requirements subject to any ultimate project approval.
- SQ explained the bird study process. DW asked if GHWF will incorporate the wedge tail eagle study in Tasmania. SQ responded the species considered was at the specialist's discretion. SQ explained the process of avoiding, mitigating and offsetting.

Summary of key improvements from new turbine layout as presented:

- 30% less WT from 32 to 23
- Greater than 30% reductions in infrastructure
- Sensitive areas avoided
- 30% further away from closest neighbour
- Further away from all neighbours
- 50% further away from communications tower
- Further away from existing infrastructure

Turbine Layout - Next Steps

- SQ briefly outlined next steps relating to the turbine layout
- He advised that following today's initial presentation to the CCC, key studies including finalisation of bird assessments, visual impact assessments noise assessments, water, waste, transport, etc will be undertaken with further opportunity for input by the CCC.
- Community and neighbour engagement will occur with both postal and online distribution of the new layout through a newsletter.
- Near neighbour consultation will be commencing tomorrow as part of the ongoing consultation with closest neighbours.

Item 4: Cooma FCC and RFS Feedback

- SQ provided an update of discussions with District Manager of Snowy Monaro Fire Control Centre and Rural Fire Service (RFS).
- It was noted RFS considered construction important and the feedback is the RFS is comfortable construction risks are resolved through the project's management plans.
- SQ advised wind farms, including those in Monaro region, are acknowledged by the local RFS as beneficial to firefighting including provision and maintenance of access tracks, clearing (fire breaks) and communications.
- Turbines are not considered a problem as they are viewed as other known obstacles and that wind farms do not represent a big issue to firefighting.
- MR asked if the taller towers will attract more lightning. SQ briefly discussed some new media on this. SQ to share articles with CCC members – ACTION ITEM.
- Concern expressed about the accuracy of reflections of RFS position and that project proponents moved from person to person to get “the view you wanted”, a claim not supported by SQ.
- EP explained the project met with Nimmitabel RFS earlier this year, following by Snowy-Monaro and Bemboka this month.
- When questioned by KB about future discussions and interaction by specialists with the CCC, SQ advised RFS had confirmed ability to attend future meetings as appropriate. SQ indicated members of local RFS including Nimmitabel RFS would be invited.
- The RFS will also undertake a future site visit with project staff.
- SQ noted GHWF and RFS commitment to work together to benefit local firefighting services.

Item 5: Specialists and Site Visit

- SQ reaffirmed discussions above that relevant specialists (including SMEC and RFS, as appropriate) will be invited by the Chair to future meetings when appropriate, to ensure CCC members are properly informed on project studies and provided opportunity to seek answers to relevant questions
- The most relevant consultants will present when studies are completed.
- SQ advised that the layout, as presented today, will likely be the one to go through to the EIS.
- It was suggested that the site visit should occur in early autumn, not on a weekend, and in the afternoon.
- SQ advised that landowners need to provide permission for site visits to go ahead.
- It was agreed the next gathering would be a site visit subject to approvals and confirmation.

Item 6: Project Timeline Update

- SQ provided a synopsis of the updated project timeline.
- He noted that timelines must move in accordance with the mandated consultation timeframes, reaffirming previous discussions that timelines are not condensed to suit project proponents.
- Noted adjustment needed in the presentation to reflect expected dated of public comment at Q3 2020, not Q3 2019.

6. General Business

- PG thanked SQ for his presentation and CCC members for their input and discussion.
- CCC members were invited to raise other matters relevant to the proposed project that had not already been discussed.
- VP asked if GHWF has sourced where the water will come from and the requirements. SQ explained it will be completed in the studies.
- MD enquired about noise assessments and the varying methods in assessing noise.
- SQ advised that specialists will look at the proposed layouts and make assessments against specific noise receptors.
- It was noted that noise follows particular climatic conditions, all conditions were taken into account.
- Advice provided that the wind mast being used for data collection will be used for modelling noise.
- Suggestion made that the wind mast could also be used to gauge impact of new 230m turbine tips.
- KB raised that photo montages should be available for site visit as an important reference for CCC members. SQ reiterated that montages would be done at the specialist's discretion for the VIA and they were unlikely to be done before the visit particularly given time of year and proximity to visit. He would check to see if something was possible internally
- Questions also raised about project life-cycle costs.
- MR suggested CCC members review an article by Tony Thomas relating to impact of wind farms.

Meeting closed: 5.38pm

Next meeting date:

Site visit - Tuesday, 25th February 2020 commencing at 2.00pm
(Details to be confirmed closer to visit date)

Meeting: - Tuesday, 31st March 2020 commencing at 4.00pm, p
(Consultants present as appropriate) (TBC)

ACTION ITEMS ON NEXT PAGE

Action Items:

Action	Person responsible	Timing and completion date	Completed
Provide CCC with the articles on fires discussing reduction of impacts from lightning from presence of turbines.	GHWF	Before next meeting/site visit	IN PROGRESS
Provide CCC with a map showing contours and co-ordinates, i.e a topographic map	GHWF	Before next meeting/site visit	IN PROGRESS
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	YES
Community Engagement Summary of top concerns from nearby neighbours and stakeholders	Elizabeth Picker	Completed in August 2019	YES
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 report to PG	Michaela Samman	Report one and Report two	YES

Action	Person responsible	Timing and completion date	Completed
Provide a link to the TV documentary	David Williams	Link one and 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