

# Minutes of Meeting

## White Rock Wind Farm Community Consultative Committee

<b>Present:</b>	Jane Newsome	Chair	JN
	Adrian Maddocks	Development Manager, Goldwind	AM
	Sandra Royal	Local Representative, WRWF	SR
	Sunny Rutherford	Community Engagement Manager, Goldwind	SRu
	Adam Anderson	Community Representative (host landowner)	AAn
	Anthony Alliston	Inverell Shire Council Representative	AA
	Steve Toms	Glen Innes Severn Council Representative	ST
	Neil Eigeland	Community Representative	NE
	Robert Dulhunty	Community Representative (host landowner)	RD
	Dan Ford	Project Manager, White Rock Solar Farm	DF
	Brian Hall	Senior Development Manager, CECEP	BH
<b>Apologies:</b>	Sandy Fitzgerald	Observer	SF
	Ruth Sim-Brummell	Observer	RSB
	David Dettwiler	Site Representative, WRWF	DD
	Joanne Wright	Community Representative	JW
	Lauren Zell	North East Regional Coordinator, Regional Clean Energy Program (RCEP) (observer)	LZ
	Peter Sniekers	Department of Premier and Cabinet (observer)	PS
<b>Date:</b>	9 November 2017 at 1:30pm		
<b>Venue:</b>	William Gardner Room, Glen Innes Severn Learning Centre, 71 Grey Street, Glen Innes 2370		
<b>Purpose:</b>	Community Consultative Committee Meeting No. 10		

### Minutes:

Item	Agenda / Comment / Discussion	Action
1	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>The <b>Chair</b> opened the Community Consultative Committee (CCC) meeting at 1:30pm, welcomed all attendees to the meeting.</p>	
2	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies received as above.</p> <p>Motion to accept Apologies: moved by <b>ST</b> seconded by <b>AAn</b>. Motion carried.</p>	

Item	Agenda / Comment / Discussion	Action
3	<p><b>Declaration of pecuniary or other interests.</b></p> <p><b>AAn</b> and <b>RD</b> declared their interest as host landowners and <b>JN</b> declared her interest as Partner in Roberts and Morrow.</p> <p>Motion to accept Declarations: Moved by <b>RD</b> seconded by <b>ST</b>. Motion carried.</p>	
4	<p><b>Confirmation of previous minutes</b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting on the 3 August 2017 were accepted.</p> <p>Motion to accept Minutes: Moved by <b>ST</b> seconded <b>AAn</b>. Motion carried.</p>	
5	<p><b>Business arising from previous minutes</b></p> <p><b>Action item 13</b> – <b>SR</b> to organise a media release introducing the new Chair, CCC members, and what the CCC is about.</p> <p><b>Action item 16</b> – <b>SR</b> to organise meeting with editor of the Inverell Times Dependent on Action item 13</p> <p><b>Action item 17</b> – <b>SR</b> to email Urbis Report link to CCC members Emailed out with Meeting #10 documents on 27/10/2017</p> <p><b>Action item 18</b> – <b>LZ</b> to send <b>DF</b> Moree Solar Farm information Complete</p> <p><b>Action item 19</b> – <b>DF</b> to note waste disposal requirements with UGL Complete – <b>DF</b> confirmed that wood pallets used have certification of appropriate disposal or reuse with most being shipped back to Brisbane</p>	<p><b>Action item 13</b> – Closed for Stage 1, but identify as an action for Stage 2</p> <p><b>Action item 16</b> – Closed</p> <p><b>Action item 17</b> – Closed</p> <p><b>Action item 18</b> – Closed</p> <p><b>Action item 19</b> – Closed</p>
6	<p><b>Correspondence</b></p> <p>The <b>Chair</b> noted that there were three (3) items of incoming correspondence since the previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Email from <b>SRu</b> advising of the Local Emergency Management Committee visit to WRSF</li> <li>- Media release for the WRWF Open Day on 4 November 2017</li> <li>- Email from <b>LZ</b> providing WRWF Open Day feedback and about the positive nature of the event. CCC members agreed with the content.</li> </ul> <p>Motion to accept Correspondence: Moved by <b>JR</b> seconded by <b>AM</b> Motion carried.</p>	
7	<p><b>Project update</b></p> <p><b>AM</b> presented the WRWF and WRWF S2 project update including:</p>	

Item	Agenda / Comment / Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of project details including: project overview, timeline, alternative 330kV connection</li> <li>• All turbines are installed for Stage 1 with 68 turbines commissioned</li> <li>• Power is being exported to the grid through the commissioning of the Transgrid substation which is a gated process</li> <li>• Expected that full commissioning would be completed at end 2017</li> <li>• Community engagement activities were identified including sponsorship, presentations, VIP visits, and events including the WRWF Open Day</li> <li>• Glen Innes Severn Council was identified as being the successful organisation to administer the community fund. Refer to Item 8 for further details.</li> <li>• Stage 2 project overview included proposed project map, indicative timeline, and noted that of the 48 turbines in Stage 2, 28 are part of the original EA approval, and 20 are relocated turbines requiring consent. Maximum generating capacity for Stage 2 will be 171MW using Goldwind GW140 3S Smart Wind Turbines with a tip height of 200m.</li> </ul> <p><b>DF</b> presented the White Rock Solar Farm project update including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussed the heights of the panel frames with the lowest edge at a minimum 500mm off the ground and approximately 2700mm at the highest edge. <b>DF</b> noted that due to the undulations in the ground the heights do vary across the site.</li> <li>• Piling and trenching were 80% complete</li> <li>• Expected completion is around Q1/2 2018</li> </ul> <p>Members discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>JR</b> advised that he spoke to a number of people at the Open day and that it was a great day for WRWF</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> noted that the Sapphire Wind Farm turbine blades have a serration on the edge. <b>AM</b> advised that some of the WTG have been allocated a serration which should help reduce noise. <b>AM</b> advised that the allocated WTGs are along the Ilparran leg and noted that the project is compliant and that the serrations are an added extra.</li> <li>• <b>RD</b> asked when the wind farm would be fully commissioned. <b>AM</b> advised that it should be at the end of the year but depends if there are any issues with the commissioning process.</li> <li>• <b>JN</b> asked whether the WTGs are commissioned individually or in clusters. <b>AM</b> advised that they are commissioned individually, but are clustered in groups of 10. Commissioning includes the testing of the WTGs and the cables taking the power to the substation.</li> <li>• <b>AA</b> asked what is the cost that electricity is sold to the market. <b>AM</b> advised that WRWF does not have a fixed price Power Purchase Agreement (PPA), instead we 'sell at the gate' at market rate that is subject to supply-and-demand market forces.</li> <li>• <b>NE</b> noted that he had not noticed many WTGs working. <b>AM</b> advised that it was part of the substation commissioning process, to ensure that power from the wind farm does not impact on the local network. The</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action item 20 - AM</b> to confirm that the WTGs trialling serrations are along the Ilparran leg</p>

Item	Agenda / Comment / Discussion	Action
	wind farm has to pass a series of tests, with the power increasing as each test is passed until full output is achieved.	
8	<p><b>Community Fund</b></p> <p><b>SR</b> updated the members including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process to date (refer to presentation)</li> <li>• Successful candidate – Glen Innes Severn Council</li> </ul> <p>Members discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>JN</b> asked when the community fund would commence. <b>AM</b> advised that it would be once the project had finished the commissioning phase and entered Operations.</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> asked if the positions on the WRWF Community Fund committee would be advertised. <b>AM</b> advised that details are being worked through at this time and the CCC would be advised.</li> <li>• <b>RD</b> noted that he had concerns that representational boards do not work and it is far more beneficial to have committee members who have the interest of the community at the core, not a business or alliance to someone/something.</li> <li>• Members asked whether it would be a conflict of interest for GISC to be administrator of the community fund and be on the panel. <b>AM</b> noted that the administrator role was to support the panel decision and had no influence or decision-making power. <b>ST</b> noted that it would be a representative of the elected GISC and that the administrator role would be completed in the Corporate Services section of Council.</li> <li>• <b>RD, AAn</b> and <b>JR</b> asked if the contract with the administrator could be available to CCC members. <b>AM</b> noted that the contract is a standard service agreement and is commercial in confidence. A summary of the terms could be made available for CCC members.</li> <li>• <b>SRu</b> noted that there had been significant discussion and input from the CCC into the draft guidelines that provide the framework that is principles based.</li> <li>• <b>BH</b> noted to the group that the obligation was with WRWF and not the CCC for the allocation of administrator and panel members. <b>BH</b> also added that the lifespan of the fund is 25 years and the guidelines will be changed over the time, and at this point in time the CCC is overseeing the establishment of the inaugural year.</li> <li>• <b>JR</b> and <b>RD</b> asked what fee GISC would be paid to administer the community fund. <b>ST</b> advised that the administrator role would be at no cost to the community fund. <b>SRu</b> noted that on the contract it must identify a cost which is \$1.00 and that GISC would be required to provide quarterly reports.</li> <li>• <b>RD</b> was concerned about transparency to the community about the decision to have GISC administer the fund. <b>SR</b> noted that all organisations have been provided the option to gain constructive feedback.</li> <li>• <b>SR</b> noted that the next steps include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- discussions with GISC about the draft contract</li> <li>- signing of the contract</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Action item 21 - SR</b> to send CCC members a summary of the process to select a fund administrator (GISC) and summary of the draft contract (not yet agreed by parties).</p> <p><b>Action item 22 - SR</b> to send to draft WRWF Community Fund committee member EOI to CCC member for their feedback</p>

Item	Agenda / Comment / Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- summary of contract to CCC members</li> <li>- expression of interest for the WRWF Community Fund committee members released to the community.</li> </ul>	
9	<p><b>Community feedback</b></p> <p>Members provided the following feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>JR, AAn, JN and ST</b> all noted that the WRWF Open day was a great success for the community, at a personal and business level.</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> advised the he went along to the department of Planning meeting regarding the Glen Innes Wind Farm modifications. <b>ST</b> noted that the attendees expressed concerns about the cumulative impact on the community, and that the attendees were angry that GIWF had not engaged with them compared to the other wind farms.</li> <li>• <b>JR</b> noted that the concern is that when the wind blows in a certain way the noise comes down the valley. <b>BH</b> explained that noise testing has commenced and will continue. <b>AM</b> noted that noise at Ilparran Road is being investigated because of the concerns raised in the valley and that testing is being completed by independent consultants. WRWF take all concerns seriously and will continue to investigate the turbines on Ilparran Road to ensure they are complaint.</li> </ul>	
10	<p><b>General Business</b></p> <p><b>Rates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AAn</b> asked both Council representatives how did they come up with the rates charging to landowners.</li> <li>• <b>AA</b> said that he did not believe the CCC was the forum to discuss land rating matters associated with the wind farm. <b>AA</b> noted that as <b>RD</b> and <b>AAn</b> are involved landowners and should take up rating issues with the relevant Council(s) separate to the CCC meeting.</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> asked <b>AAn</b> whether his land had been revalued.</li> <li>• <b>AAn</b> and <b>RD</b> advised that all land values had increased, and that they would like the community to know where the additional funding from the increased rates will be allocated to – will it be used on road upgrades such as Grahams Valley and Ilparran Roads or put into the general Council coffers? <b>RD</b> would like the community to be aware of the increased benefit as a result of WRWF.</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> advise that he had not seen any details and would look into the rating process. <b>ST</b> noted that normally Council receives a proposal from the Rates section which occurs once a year and goes out for public viewing.</li> <li>• <b>BH</b> advised that WRWF have written to both Councils asking about the rates and noted that it was the rates over and above the value of the land that was being discussed. Essentially the accepted process is that the increased portion of rates is paid by the wind farm and the landowner pays the remainder.</li> <li>• It was agreed that further discussion on the individual rating of landowner properties would be progressed through the WRWF Landowner meetings.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action item 23 - ST</b> to update the CCC on the rating process used at GISC at the next meeting</p>

Item	Agenda / Comment / Discussion	Action
	<p><b>Other:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST</b> opened discussion on setting up an information centre about the wind farms and noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sinclair's Lookout is the obvious choice</li> <li>- Sapphire Wind Farm have an interest</li> <li>- Glen Innes Wind Farm are required to do works within that area for their community fund</li> <li>- White Rock Wind Farm have identified previously that there is interest in the idea</li> <li>- There was a lot of interest from the community and visitors especially after the WRWF Open Day.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>ST</b> noted that there is great scope for a proposal from the minimal information sharing (change of ownership of land, joint interpretative panels and static display) through to a maned information centre – it is all dependent on the cost.</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> advised that the reason for raising the idea at this forum is to find out how much buy in there is for WRWF (and other wind farms)</li> <li>• <b>AM</b> advised that it was too early to say at the moment but at a GWA level it was a favourable idea.</li> <li>• <b>BH</b> agreed and that there need to be further discussion about cost sharing, but asked whether the community want this.</li> <li>• <b>RD</b> identified that it is demand driven and that the basic interest would come from schools and tourism, and noted that GIWF would have a turbine quite close to the land area under discussion. <b>RD</b> also noted that this would assist to stop the illegal access to wind farms. <b>JR</b> agreed and sees the idea as a great tourism opportunity for the area.</li> <li>• <b>NE</b> supports the plan but whatever is the outcome it needs to be meaningful.</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> advised that the proposed entrance would be near the GIWF entrance and therefore would be easier to access.</li> <li>• <b>ST</b> noted that if Council was to continue with this idea, it would need to be supported for ongoing costs separate to the existing Council funding. Costs could include: up-front costs and an ongoing commitment, but is dependent on the overall options decided on.</li> </ul> <p><b>SRu</b> left the meeting at 3:05pm.</p> <p><b>AM</b> left the meeting at 3:30pm.</p>	
11	<p><b>Next meeting</b></p> <p>The next meeting will be held at 1.30 pm, <b>Thursday 8 February 2018</b> at the William Gardner Room, Glen Innes Learning Centre, 71 Grey Street Glen Innes.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 3:34pm</p>	