

FLYERS CREEK WIND FARM
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes For June 24, 2013

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Date: | 24 June 2013 Blayney Community Centre |
| Attendees: | Mr. Grahame Collier (Chair) Mr. Leon Rodwell (Blayney Shire Council) Mr. Kim Masters (Host landowner) Mr. Simon Wright (Orange resident) Mr. Jonathan Upson (Proponent–Infigen Energy) |
| Apologies: | Mr. Kevin Scott (Neighbour) Dr. Colleen Watts (Neighbour) Mr. Ian White (Neighbour) |

Welcome & Introductions

The Chair, Grahame Collier, called the meeting to order shortly after 6pm. The three apologies were noted and the committee members and observers welcomed to the meeting. The agenda circulated prior to the meeting was confirmed.

The minutes from the previous meeting on the 18th of March 2013, circulated prior to the meeting, were confirmed with one modification. The adopted minutes will be circulated.

Business Arising

The Chair reminded committee members to nominate an alternate to attend meetings to which they are unable to attend. The Chair stated he would follow up with the three committee members who had not nominated alternates as yet.

A short discussion was had with respect to the status of the NSW Wind Farm Guidelines. Jonathan and the Chair agreed that it was their understanding the finalised guidelines may be released soon; however, this has been the status of the draft Guidelines, released in December 2011, for quite some time.

Current Status of the Proposal

Jonathan reported that the Department of Planning & Infrastructure (DPI) had posted Infigen's Response to Submissions and Preferred Project Report on the Department's website. See: http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=2644.

The next steps in the process are as follows:

- DPI will complete a Planning Assessment Report which will be submitted to the Planning Assessment Commission (PAC). This is expected to occur in August.
- The PAC will likely convene three meetings---one with DPI, one with Infigen and a public meeting in the Blayney district for interested stakeholders. After the meetings are concluded, the PAC will make a determination on the proposal.

Jonathan described how the PAC process is very different from the previous Government's assessment of major projects where the Planning Minister made the decisions whether to approve or reject planning applications. One observer stated that a PAC decision for one proposal occurred within one month of the last of the three meetings, so the PAC process appears to be relatively expeditious. Also it is understood the meeting in the community will take the form of a hearing, but the format will be confirmed by the PAC.

Response to Submissions Report

Jonathan reviewed the planning process and how the recently submitted Response to Submissions (RtS) and Preferred Project Report (PPR) fit into the planning process. Jonathan stated the RtS report is very lengthy as the submissions raised a large number of issues, most of which had to do with wind energy, in general, rather than specific concerns with the Flyers Creek project. As there were many submissions making similar points, the RtS report is categorised into specific issues with a table in the back listing the issues raised by each submission thereby enabling submitters to readily locate the responses to the submissions they raised.

The RtS report and appendices contain over 230 pages and contain several new studies and reports including:

- An additional bat survey
- An additional Superb Parrot survey
- A construction traffic report including current traffic levels and estimated traffic levels during the construction period
- An independent review of the noise report submitted by The Acoustic Group

The question was raised about the opportunity for community input with regards to the RtS report. Jonathan replied that while there was no formal consultation process, the community could express their opinions to DPI or to the PAC during their hearing in the district. In addition, Infigen would be pleased to respond to questions or comments about the RtS report, and in fact were already responding to one neighbour in this regard.

Jonathan noted that the availability of the RtS report was covered in the local paper the previous week including a weblink to where the report could be located.

Preferred Project Report

Jonathan explained that as part of the Response to Submissions process, the proponent normally develops a 'Preferred Project Report' which documents any changes made to the proposed development as described in the Environmental Assessment. Updated maps and figures are included in the PPR to document any revisions to the proposal.

Jonathan stated that Infigen had made two primary changes in response to the submissions which are documented in the Preferred Project Report:

1. Turbine #17 has been deleted from the project primarily due to visual amenity and construction traffic concerns raised by several neighbours to the East of this turbine. The Flyers Creek wind farm proposal is now a 43 turbine proposal.
2. The proposed north-south section of the transmission line on Cadia Mine's property has been moved to the west in line with suggestions made by Cadia.

The PPR has also been posted on DPI's website.

Consultation Processes and Future Opportunities

The community newsletter was discussed and Jonathan indicated that the drafting of the newsletter is in progress, and that it was more appropriate now that there was some 'news' to report---the Response to Submissions process being completed. Leon stated that they had recently obtained advice that a list of addresses could be provided to Infigen; however, the list of addresses would not have names included. The list would just have 'Resident' and the address. Once the newsletter is completed and the address list is ready, Jonathan stated the newsletter would be sent out as soon as practical.

The next major step for the Community would be the on-site hearing in the district held by the PAC. Jonathan stated he understood that the PAC organised their own publicity for the hearing, but he would endeavour to have the date and procedure for the hearing well covered by local print and radio media. Leon stated he would be happy to also post details of the PAC hearing on the Blayney Shire website.

Victorian Department of Health Report

Jonathan tabled a report produced by the Victorian State Department of Health entitled, *Wind farms, sound and health*. Jonathan stated that the report was significant as VicHealth is the group of experts charged with looking after the health of Victorian citizens. He read several quotes from the report stating that low frequency noise, and infrasound, from wind turbines (or other sources) that cannot be heard, are not able to cause detrimental health impacts. Colleen had previously emailed the Committee a letter from Dr. Salt from the USA and Professor Colin Hanson from the University of Adelaide which had a contrary view of the VicHealth report. Leon suggested the committee take note of the two rebuttals.

The Chair informed the Committee that all reports, studies and papers are to be distributed through him and are not to be sent to Committee members directly. The Chair stated he wants to keep the volume of tabled papers to a reasonable level, primarily because it is beyond the scope of the Committee. He stated that he will notify the Committee in the event that he decides not to circulate a paper sent to him and why this decision had been made.

Other Business

The Chair raised the issue of whether the Committee wanted to allow recording, analog or digital, of the CCC meetings. Some discussion ensued, but there were no Committee members who felt that recording of meetings would be a benefit. Kim moved, and Jonathan seconded, a motion stating that,

“Flyers Creek CCC Meetings are not to be recorded without the consent of the Committee; this applies to committee members and observers.”

The motion passed unanimously.

Next Meetings

Some discussion occurred with regards to whether it would be preferable to have a CCC meeting just before, or just after, the PAC hearing to be held in the district. Some advantages of both approaches were discussed. The Committee agreed that the next CCC meeting should occur near the time of the PAC hearing and that the Chair and Jonathan would set a date. Therefore, the previously established dates for meetings this year would not occur on the dates specified at the last meeting.

Conclusion

The Chair thanked committee members for their involvement in the meeting and observers for their attendance and the meeting was concluded at 7:35pm.

Agreed Decisions / Resolutions from Previous Meetings

| Agenda Item | Proposed Resolution(s) |
|-------------|--|
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each Committee member to nominate an alternate should they not be able to attend a CCC meeting In progress |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCC discuss the community enhancement fund at the next meeting Discussion occurred at March Meeting; motion to revisit the topic after a planning decision passed |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponent clarifies their role and responsibilities in relation to the CCC (Appendix C of the NDWFG). Completed |
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule CCC meetings for the rest of CY 2013 at next CCC meeting On hold pending clarification of the planning process timetable |
| 5 | |
| | |

Key Issues

| # | Proposed Resolution(s) | Who | When | Status |
|---|---|----------|-------------------------|--|
| 1 | Infigen to consider a regular newsletter to the neighbours of the project | Jonathan | Before Next CCC meeting | Infigen to issue a newsletter once the newsletter and address list are completed |
| 2 | CCC discuss and formulate a community consultation plan should the FCWF project be approved | CCC | Next Meeting | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |