

<p>Crookwell 2 & 3 Wind Farms Minutes</p> <p>5th Meeting of Community Consultative Committee 13/06/2014</p> <p>Project: Crookwell 2 and Crookwell 3 Wind Farm projects</p> <p>Meeting No: #5</p> <p>Date: Friday 13 June 2014</p> <p>Venue and Time: Crookwell Library, Art Gallery 2.00pm – 3.30pm</p> <p>Documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agenda ▪ Draft letter regarding RFS Kennerley presentation <p>Attendees:</p> <p>Chair: Don Elder (DE)</p> <p>Secretary (acting): Tom Mitchell (TM)</p> <p>Union Fenosa/Crookwell Development Pty Ltd representative members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tom Mitchell (Legal Manager) (TM) <p>Community representative members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chris Croker (CC) ▪ Maurice Newman (MN) ▪ Steve Ward (SW) <p>Council representative members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cr Malcolm Barlow (Upper Lachlan Shire Council)(MB) ▪ Cr Paul Culhane (Upper Lachlan Shire Council) (PC) <p>Observers in attendance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Humphrey Price-Jones (President of the NSW Landscape Guardians Inc)(HP) ▪ Unidentified observers (5) 	<p>Action:</p>
<p>Agenda Item 1: Apologies</p> <p>Apologies: Received from Jean Dooley, Shaq Mohajerani (late notice due to being sick with illness), Jamie Buck</p>	<p>Action:</p>
<p>Agenda Item 2: Declaration of pecuniary interests</p> <p>None</p>	
<p>Agenda Item 3: Minutes of meeting held 17 May 2013</p> <p>DE: Proposed acceptance of Minutes. Moved TM, seconded PC</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Minutes #3 confirmed</p>

<p>Agenda Item 4: Minutes of meeting held 13 September 2013</p> <p><i>DE: Proposed acceptance of Minutes. Moved TM, seconded PC.</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Minutes#4 confirmed</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Business arising from the minutes</p> <p><i>TM: Discussed Agenda item 5a. Confirmed continued recording of Minutes, then transcription, and then reduction to 10 page Minutes. Confirmed contact with ULSC to request Helen to assist with Minutes, which was declined because of inconsistent timing for meetings, and brevity of meetings. Confirmed that UFWA would continue to attend meetings and attempt to bring two representatives.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Discussed Agenda item 5b. Thanked Art Gallery for kind use of gallery space for one-on-one meetings held earlier this year in February. Gallery venue is superior because audio recording acoustics are good and it's warm.</i></p> <p><i>DE: Requested a larger table</i></p> <p><i>TM: Discussed noise and neighbourhood agreement at Agenda item 5c. Reported that since our last meeting UFWA settled the commercial terms of the deal with the Council, and that UFWA would sign the Voluntary Planning Agreement when the number and location of CW3 turbines were settled, and when UFWA had ensured that the planning scheme doesn't change unpredictably again before we commit to those private contracts with the Council and with landowners.</i></p> <p><i>MB: Queried whether variable number of turbines only applied to CW3 project. Queried 3 turbines discussed as prospects to join northern section of CW2 near property Elmgrove.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Confirmed CW2 was proceeding based on 46 turbines layout following modifications to original permits. Undertook to investigate history of negotiation regarding turbines in vicinity of Elmgrove.</i></p> <p><i>DE: Turned to discussion of submission to the government and in that regard Malcolm gave me a copy of his submission to Council, which I adapted and then did a draft letter which I sent to everyone.</i></p> <p><i>CC: Requested to comment upon this letter. Stated that I don't think that it is the place of this committee to be sending individual letters to Ministers. The committee is a consultative group, and information provided by Kennerley regarding the Fire Service is information available to community through Minutes and I presume by the government bodies. Angry that members of committee are trying to use it as a conduit and extension of the anti-wind farm lobby. Proposed that the letter should not be sent because it didn't express Kennerly's actual views based on transcript, his understanding as a senior Captain of the Fire Brigade. Moved that we do not send that letter. Seconded by TM.</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Prepare room with larger table at future meetings.</p> <p>Provide summary of negotiation regarding 3 turbines at next meeting. Contact Dooley with summary.</p>

TM: Argued that original purpose of letter was to raise issue as concern for other CCC's, and not to be sent to people involved with decision making relating to projects, as that is not the remit of the CCC. Nominated Office of Environment and Heritage as an appropriate forum for sharing of the letter.

MN: Commented that when Ian Kennerly gave his views on fire fighting he indicated that the aerial bombing was 40% of the effort, and said that local fire chief, Andrew Nixon, told him personally at a meeting of the Roslyn Fire Brigade that in the case of Bannister, we are very fortunate that there were no wind turbines there, because that fire would have got out of control and would have headed to Goulburn. Disputed notion that concern of fire risk is somehow related to anti-wind turbine lobby. Declared responsibility, if our communities are endangered by the existence of wind turbines, to make that awareness known to Ministers and government. Had arranged for a meeting as a private citizen with the former Emergency Services Minister (removed by ICAC).

TM: Disputed Kennerly made any claim that turbines would lead to an increase in fire insurance premium, as described in letter.

MN: Claimed it was a relevant item. Said he sat on Board of major insurer. Undertook to seek written advice from insurer that turbines, where the risk is increased, then insure will look to increasing premiums.

TM: Disputed MN recollection of Kennerly presentation, directed him to accurate record in the annexure to the minutes, where Kennerly said that in the event that there is a fire and wind turbines are an issue then they would simply change their tactics or use different attack approaches for aerial water bombardment. Also recalled Malcolm's radio interview where an RFS more senior than Mr Ian Kennerly said there were no issues with water bombing of wind farms. Concluded that when assessing the wind farms, through the planning system, the aerial and aerial fire-bombing is given consideration because the RFS is an agency that comments on the wind farms. Aerials is one of those aspects of planning that you need to address, and the planning system measures real risks against real hazards, and it strikes a balance. And nobody would be derelict in any duty, because the planning department has already given serious consideration to this very issue.

MN: Commented on recollection of Kennerly presentation, and expressed desire that somebody such as the Minister for Emergency Services, or from the Department of Emergency Services, can verify that there is no additional risk to residents in this area from the existence of wind turbines in the event of fire.

MB: Referred to comment about my telephone call to Orange ABC, saying the Deputy Commissioner who spoke to Orange was talking about state wide basis, and he said about 10% aerial bombing for state wide. Said Kennerly was talking about this rugged area where aerial fighting is a very important component as compared

<p>to ground fighting.</p> <p>DE: Queried whether CCC was to continue with proposal to send any letter.</p> <p>SW, PC: Confirmed belief that a letter would be sent.</p> <p>DE: If we don't agree to send the letter, well, so be it. If we do agree, then your question arises as to whom it is to be sent.</p> <p>CC: Requested opportunity to confirm with Ian that he has said 30 to 40%, I would like to know whether that is a monetary value compared to a manpower value.</p> <p>DE: Put motion that the letter not be sent. TM, CC in favour. Motion lost. Proposed question as to whom the letter is to be sent?</p> <p>TM: Proposed discussion around the content of the letter. Discussion allowed by Chair.</p> <p>TM: Queried source of letter, whether wholly and solely based on text proposed by MB based on his own letter to Council.</p> <p>DE: Confirmed that at previous meeting members of the committee were invited to send to me any submissions they wished raised in a letter. Said only one who replied was Malcolm, who sent me a copy of his report to the Upper Lachlan Council which was checked against the transcript of Kennerly's comments.</p> <p>TM: Said that UFWA had sent an e-mail with a proposed letter text in the body of e-mail describing the letter that we would propose for drafting purposes. Undertook to provide email to DE. Said email noted that the concerns were very much the concerns of individual members of the committee, that letter should acknowledge the fact that the projects go through a rigorous planning process, and should also attach the words of Mr Kennerly himself. Expressed opinion that the annexure verbatim says there's nothing for us to be concerned about among those words, and belief that Mr Kennerly himself would be very happy to let his own words speak for him, rather than let people from this committee take his words and use them for their own purposes.</p> <p>MB: Proposed to read text of his Council report, read briefly from report.</p> <p>TM: Repeated that there's a planning process, and that the RFS, CASA, all of those agencies who are relevant to fire bombing and attacking fire on the ground all have input in the planning process. And if they were concerned that local resources, that local fire fighters were going to be under-resourced, then they would raise it in their submission, in their agency comments. For the recent Crookwell 3 exhibition we received zero comments from agencies about fire, and an equal number of supporting and objecting comments from non-agencies. Proposed that UFWA text should be incorporated into letter, and we should specify that Mr Kennerly's own words be annexed to the letter.</p>	<p>TM provide DE with copy of UFWA email proposing text for letter</p>
---	--

<p><i>MN: Moved motion that the letter DE prepared be the letter that be sent, and that the letter be sent to the Minister for Emergency Services, seconded MB.</i></p> <p><i>PC: Moved that letter be amended to anonymise Kennerly's identity, with reference to 'a manager in the southern zone'.</i></p> <p><i>DE: Put amended motion that this letter, anonymising Kennerly, be sent to Minister Stuart Ayres, Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Amendment carried unanimously. Requested foreshadowed amendment.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Proposed that letter refer to a transcript, and that transcript be an anonymised version of the transcript of Mr Kennerly's presentation to us at our second meeting Seconded, carried.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Proposed further amendment, that the letter refers to UFWA having an opportunity to note its own letter in response to the committee's letter. Lapsed for absence of seconder.</i></p> <p><i>DE: Referred to Agenda item 5e and 5f.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Had not brought written copies of alternate view to Salt, referred to the Vic Health report that's come out in the last year, South Australina EPA report, New South Wales Health report, CSIRO findings, all being reports on this health issue which have come out recently debunking the claims of the Waubra Foundation or Dr Alex Salt. Confirmed there are more technical papers in response to Salt.</i></p> <p><i>MB: Expressed disappointment and expectation that we were to have presented here to us today an alternative view to that of Professor Alex Salt.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Confirmed didn't have specific knowledge around this area of expertise, and thought reasonable to point to trusted health organisations and scientific organisations in Australia, and their research, and their findings on this topic.</i></p> <p><i>MB: Tabled a letter from Dr John Tonkin endorsing the eminence of Dr Salt.</i></p>	<p>Moved: Letter with IK anonymised to be sent to Minister</p> <p>Moved: Letter with IK anonymised and annexing anonymised transcript be sent to Minister.</p>
<p>Agenda Item 6: Correspondence</p> <p><i>DE: No correspondence.</i></p>	<p>Action:</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Company report, with questions</p> <p><i>DE: Directed TM to discuss company report with questions. Proposed to take</i></p>	<p>Action:</p>

questions at end of report.

TM: Confirmed we do have a lot to report, because Crookwell 2 has turned a significant corner in the last six months. To point 7(a), all public submissions from the display of the Crookwell Three project have been received by the company, we've responded to those submissions in a response to the planning department, the planning department has said that they believe our responses are adequate, so they're now on display. You can find those on our website unionfenosa.com.au. They tabulate responses to very specific questions were put to us, and also to generalist questions have been clubbed together into one class of question. We've provided a response to those, and they're tabulated on the Crookwell Three webpag,

TM: To point 7(b), this is the exciting thing that's happened for this project in New South Wales recently. The ACT government, which is governed by a Labour/Green coalition, has committed to a large target for renewable energy to be deployed in the Capital. The consequence of that is that they've embarked on a purchasing scheme, where they offer feed in tariffs for a fixed term, a fixed price feed in tariff, to renewable energy projects. They've been through a process of offering feed in tariffs to solar farms in the ACT, and in March this year they announced that they were going to purchase 200 megawatts of power from wind farms in the Australian Capital Region.

MN: Queried the need for further supply to the ACT.

TM: Responded that the ACT's purchase of green electricity will essentially displace black electricity that they import from coal plants, gas plants. Under the RET, the retailers in the ACT would need to find 20% of their power from a green source by 2020e. The ACT government is using its power over the retailer, Actew AGL, to compel the retailer to take 90% of the ACT's power from a green source, above and beyond the requirements of the RET. The ACT's doing quite an ambitious thing, which is pretty exciting for anybody who's supportive of the deployment of renewables in Australia.

MB: Questioned whether the ACT was going to have to have a separate grid connection to Canberra, because if it goes into the same grid, all electricity gets mixed up.

TM: Described operation of grid and management of intermittency. Continued that the ACT is not only committed to that 90% target, but it's really trying to build new industries in this Australian Capital Region. So that's a real fillip for places like Goulburn, places like Crookwell, because the three or four most competitive projects are somewhere between Collector, here, and Lake George. The ones most likely to go ahead fall within that arc, and the ACT government is trying to achieve two things. First it's trying to build an industry cluster, which spreads between the ACT out towards the region where the wind farm are, and that's about making sure that local SMEs get the biggest slice possible of the wind farm work, to ensure that

they're developed so they can export their growing capability in construction or electrics. The ACT's other object is to develop an industry within the ACT which is more focused on education, expertise associated with renewables. Canberra is really trying to position itself as a centre of excellence for renewables in Australia. It sees states like Victoria and New South Wales as wasting their opportunity, and it wants to sweep in and build another leg to its economy, so that the jobs associated with this idea of a renewable economy become a third or fourth leg for the ACT economy.

TM: An important aspect of the ACT bid, when we are offering our price into the auction for the feed in tariff, is that we need to kick a number of goals across industry engagement and community engagement broadly, and those issues will be considered when the ACT makes its decision in December.

TM: To point 7(c), the geotechnical studies for Crookwell Three have been completed by a group called SMEC using some local contractors out of Goulburn to do our geotech drilling at Crookwell Three in December. There were some press releases related to that in the Gazette. That's been completed successfully, which means we can now produce maps like this (referring to draft Detail Design), showing road alignments noted with sort of GPS points, chainage, road widths, alignments, things like that. Documents like this have already been produced for Crookwell Two. All that relates to the draft design of the road networks, which is point 7(d), which I've just touched on.

TM: Regarding point 7(e), we've sent out a whole bunch of letters to local business. And you may have maybe received them if your business is in a construction category, based on a business address spreadsheet we received from ULSC.

PC: Didn't recall letter, but has an accounting business.

SW: Recalled information but not sure whether it was a letter sent to me or the letter in the paper, but I did read it.

TM: Letters were sent out to about 90 addresses in Crookwell shared with me by the economic advisor out of Upper Lachlan Shire Council. The economic advisor out of the Goulburn Shire Council shared a similar list with me of e-mail addresses, so an e-mail was sent out to those guys. That was advising two things, that people either contact Fenosa and have their name registered on a private register that we keep of their business and their interest in the Crookwell Two and Three projects, or to contact a group called the Industry Capability Network. We've been simultaneously advertising in both the Gazette and the Post for the last month, and will continue for another month, to advertise our alliance with them to encourage people to register their business on the ICN website.

The purpose of all of this is to get all of those names, numbers and expressions of interest in one place, so that when we appoint a short list of head contractors to build the Crookwell Two project for us, in our deal with them they'll be compelled to

contact all of those people and give them a full and fair opportunity to offer their product or their service to those head contractors. And in the same way that the ACT makes a decision about our merit as a vendor of green electricity, we'll make a decision about the head contractor's merit as a builder based in part on how well they've done that industry engagement. So we're doing all the legwork to make it easy for them, to give the locals, like I said before, their full and fair opportunity to pitch their business to the right person at the right time.

TM: Community engagement is also an aspect of the bid. It accounts for 20% of the ACT's consideration, so we will be referring to the work we do here in this committee, the engagement meetings that we hold, our meetings with Council officers, and our engagement with both groups who are for and against wind farms in general.

MB: Queried what 'engagement' meant

TM: Explained that it starts with talking with you like we are now, but later includes follow up letters, door knock interviews and surveys we've conducted or had consultants conduct for us, and responding to input from the CCC. For example, after meeting with the local Landscape Guardian chapter we provided, to everybody who came to me with a very specific question, a letter follow up. . That's one example. Responding to SW's concerns in this CCC about the indexation of Neighbour Benefits for CW3 is another example.

TM: Final point is that there's a scholarship being put together with the Upper Lachlan Foundation, to go to one or two local students who can demonstrate a link to the Upper Lachlan or more broadly to Goulburn Mulwaree, who are enrolled in an ACT tertiary institution, university or trades and training, who can demonstrate merit to win the scholarship. It's targeted at local kids to get them to study in the ACT, to keep them close to parents, close to family farms, giving the best local scholars a cash award to help them study. The Foundation itself is going to run the selection process for the winning students. Ended Company Report.

MN: Expressed dissatisfaction that 2012 meeting with Landscape Guardians was described as an ambush.

MB: Queried status of VPA funding before Council, saying it had been mentioned to Council meeting by the General Manager.

TM: Described letter from General Manager saying that it's been approved by Council, that he's now in a position to sign the document. Repeated agreement had been sought that every turbine in Crookwell Two would make a payment of \$1,666.00 CPI'ed to 2008, which I think comes out at about \$2,400.00 in today's dollars. In addition there will be the same payment per turbine for the Crookwell Three projects, pending confirmation of how many turbines are approved at the end of the planning process. In addition there's a bucket of money which is a voluntary contractual offering to all of those neighbours that have a residence

<p><i>within two kilometres of a Crookwell Three turbine. They'll be given the opportunity to actually take that money themselves by private agreement with Union Fenosa at the first instance, but in the event that they don't want an agreement that money then goes back into that pot of money with the Council. A committee established by the Council, which we'll sit on will, then make decisions about where to direct those funds within 20 kilometres of the project.</i></p> <p><i>CC: With point (e), Crookwell engagement with the local businesses, I think that Union Fenosa might need to do a little bit more on that. There's some local contractors who have asked how to get a fencing job, how do you get this and that, and so the information just needs to keep coming on that.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Confirmed that Crookwell letters were sent to addresses provided by ULSC. Goulburn letters sent by email, and GMSC had followed up on those emails. Queried whether ULSC spreadsheet was up to date. Confirmed UFWA's desire to get that message out there, which we regard as the core purpose of this committee, to get that really essential information out there.</i></p> <p><i>DE: Confirmed CCC role in spreading the message to the community.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Said one of the great merits of this community is that you know people, you can get that message out to people. Even if you hate any wind farm proposal, Malcolm, it would be a real tragedy if locals in Crookwell missed out on the benefits that will flow from the wind farm just because you didn't tell them that there are real opportunities out there, and that now is the time to engage with us and our head contractor.</i></p> <p><i>Let's not forget that when you're building a wind farm, the rule of thumb is that about 40% of the total capital value is spent locally. So a wind farm like Crookwell Two, which is around \$200 million, is looking at an \$80 million spent on civils, and crushed rock, and fencing, and all those things that ought to be delivered by locals.</i></p> <p><i>PC: Commented that until now it tends to go more to Goulburn than Crookwell.</i></p> <p><i>TM: Well, it's certainly true, and I've noticed in my dealings with people who have contacted me in response to our campaign, that the Goulburn businesses are a lot more sophisticated. They're better at it, they've got the experience of engaging with major builders or multinationals like us, or with large head contractors, and they know what sort of information to provide, to whom, and to when.</i></p> <p><i>PC: Requested TM e-mail that information to us. Would pass along to interested parties.</i></p> <p><i>SW: Undertook to pass that on to the tradesman</i></p>	<p><i>TM to email details of local industry strategy to CCC members.</i></p>
<p>Agenda Item 8: General Business</p>	<p>Actions:</p>

<i>DE: No further business</i>	
Agenda Item 9: Next meeting <i>Chair: Proposed 18 July 9am for next meeting, on the day after the ULSC meeting, and on the morning of Crookwell Sports Lunch, subject to confirmation.</i> <i>MEETING CLOSED</i>	<i>Action:</i> Next meeting proposed for Friday 18 July 2014

DRAFT