



MINUTES OF THE BOCO ROCK WIND FARM COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CCC)

9.00am, Thursday 20th June 2019
Nimmitabel Community Centre, Nimmitabel

Attendees

Lisa Andrews (LA)	Independent Chairperson
Fiona Taylor (FT)	Community Representative (<i>arrived at 9.10am</i>)
Howard Charles (HC)	Community Representative
John Harrington (JH)	Community Representative
Vickie Pollard (VP)	Nimmitabel Advancement Group representative
Maryanne Renfrey (MR)	Country Women's Association representative (Nimmitabel Branch)
Bill Garnock (BG)	Community Representative (host landholder)
Sarah Blyton (SB)	Snowy Mountains Regional Council - Economic Development Officer (alternate delegate, representing Peter Bascomb)
Adam West (AW)	Facility Manager, BRWF
Mark Branson (MB)	Senior Development Manager, CWP Renewables
Jessica Petersen (JP)	Development Officer, CWP Renewables

Apologies

Nil.

Item	Action									
<p>1.0 Welcome and Introductions <i>Meeting opened at 9.08am.</i> Lisa Andrews welcomed the attendees and introduced Jessica Petersen, Development Officer at CWP Renewables and Community Liaison for Boco Rock Stage Two and also Sarah Blyton from SMRC. LA thanked VP for opening up the community early to turn heaters on.</p>	All present were requested to complete the Attendance Sheet.									
<p>2.0 Apologies – Nil.</p>										
<p>2.0 Declarations of Interest LA declared that she was an Independent Chair, approved by the Department of Planning and Environment and engaged by CWP to chair the CCC meeting.</p>	Action: Jessica Petersen to complete Code of Conduct and Pecuniary/Non Pecuniary Interest forms and return to LA.									
<p>4.0 Business arising The minutes of 3rd March 2019 were finalised and sent to CCC members on 8/6/19. Action items from the previous minutes were:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Issue</th> <th>Action By:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Keep CCC informed of CEF outcomes</td> <td>AW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Provide details of CEF expenditure and project finalised to date</td> <td>PB</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Issue	Action By:	1	Keep CCC informed of CEF outcomes	AW	2	Provide details of CEF expenditure and project finalised to date	PB	<p>1 Included in discussions (CEF Item).</p> <p>2 SB advised that the CEF has approved \$401,851 in funding to the old Cooma/Monaro LGA between 2015-2018; with \$308,602 being approved for the old Bombala LGA. LA requested an electronic version of the spreadsheet that SB was referring to, for distribution to CCC members.</p>
Item	Issue	Action By:								
1	Keep CCC informed of CEF outcomes	AW								
2	Provide details of CEF expenditure and project finalised to date	PB								

3	Copy of Charter for CEF to be provided to CCC members (Application Guidelines are available on the SMRC website, but not the charter.)	AW/LA	<p>Action: SB to confirm with SMRC.</p> <p>HC raised concern regarding the Nimmitabel Lions Club funding application for the recreational path around Lake William. Extensive discussion about the appropriate design of path (gravel vs concrete) and maintenance. It was agreed that a concrete path would be necessary to enable access for the disabled, elderly, wheelchairs, prams, etc. (See next Item for issues raised regarding the CEF.) HC advised that he would be taking this matter further as he, members of the Lions Club and the community felt very strongly about this issue.</p> <p>3 A copy of the CEF Charter is not available on the SMRC website, only the Application Guidelines. LA read out the criteria. VP to check with SMRC on whether she is able to provide a copy of the Charter to the CCC. It was suggested that the CEF Charter be reviewed (further discussion below).</p> <p>4 Not complete. Modification has not been referred to IPC as yet.</p> <p>5 Complete.</p>
4	Advise CCC when modification referred to IPC (no referral as yet, preparing Response to Submissions)	MW/LA	
5	Send copy of Council's presentation to CCC members (Complete – sent 27/3/19)	MB/LA	
<p>Concerns regarding Community Enhancement Fund: Given the extensive discussions revolving around the CEF, these concerns have been captured as a separate Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Governance and independence of committee members and their location (Bombala/Cooma). ➤ The effectiveness of the CEF Charter in meeting the requirements of the project approval and the expectations of the impacted community. ➤ The current fund does not adequately acknowledge that the purpose of the fund should be to ameliorate the impacts of the project on the residents of Nimmitabel and those impacted by transport. ➤ Local projects should get priority. ➤ The membership of the CEF is not equally weighted (4 Councillors, the General Manager and 2 volunteer community representatives from each previous LGA). ➤ Concerns that the Chair of the CEF (a non-voting role) has influence on the decision making process. ➤ Pecuniary/non-pecuniary interests. 			<p>LA advised members, that the CEF is separate to the CCC. Members felt strongly that as they are representatives for the community, they should be able to raise these concerns in this forum.</p> <p>Action: That LA write to SMRC requesting a review of the Charter.</p> <p>LA commented that this is often a concern raised by communities in other project areas.</p> <p>Action: CWP Renewables to write to Council advising of the community's concerns raised via the CCC regarding governance of the CEF and the distribution of funding to the impacted communities.</p>

- The eligibility of some communities, given their distance from the project site (Jindabyne, Bredbo, etc).
- The cumbersome assessment process for each application, which is seen to be inefficient (ranking).
- Suggestion that the CCC should be a stakeholder on the CEF to ensure funding is allocated to the communities impacted by the project.
- It was recognised that Stage 2 of the project, may be an opportunity to revisit the CEF Charter with Council and settle concerns of the community.
- Suggestion to review the CEF Charter to address concerns.
- The mechanics of the fund needs to be revisited to ensure it is governed well. Not CWP's intention to decide on funding outcomes.
- Needs to be a fully transparent process. Why is the Charter not available on the website as an ancillary document to the CEF?
- Following these extensive discussions, it was resolved that a motion be put forward for the committee's consideration.

***Condition 2.51 – Community Contributions:**

*"Prior to the commencement of construction of the project, the Proponent shall establish a **Community Enhancement Program Fund** to be jointly administered by Bombala and Cooma-Monaro Shire Councils to fund community enhancement measures in the Bombala and Cooma-Monaro Shire local government area to offset any potential residual amenity impacts associated with the project within these local government areas. Community enhancement measures may include (but not necessarily limited to) improvements to the community infrastructure and services, sustainability initiatives and opportunities for local economic and tourist development. The Proponent shall contribute an annual sum of \$2,500 per operational turbine to fund, from the commencement of operation of the project until the end of its operational life. The contribution shall be adjusted to take account of any increase in the Consumer Price Index over time, commencing at the June 2010 quarter. The terms for the administration of the funds shall be agreed between the Proponent and Bombala and Cooma-Monaro Shire Councils and submitted for the Director-General's approval prior to the commencement of construction."*

Action: SB to follow up whether Charter can be distributed to CCC members.

MOTION:

Moved by BG and seconded by HC:

- 1. That given the current Stage 2 modification, the Independent Chair of the CCC write to SMRC requesting that the Charter for the BRWF CEF be reviewed.**
- 2. That the review address the intent of the condition of consent for the project approval (2.51 Community Contributions*).**
- 3. That the review is necessary to address the amalgamation of the two previous LGAs.**
- 4. That a third party be included in the membership of the CEF committee to ensure the funds are distributed fairly (BRWF CCC community representative) in accordance with the condition of approval.**

Agreed by all members.

<p>5.0 Correspondence Report (emailed 8/6/19)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27/3/19 – Email to CCC members with the draft minutes from the meeting held on 19/3/19, together with the presentation provided to Council. • 4/4/19 – Email to CCC members with the finalised minutes and presentation from 19/3/19 meeting. • 4/6/19 – Email to CCC members asking to change the meeting date for June 2019 • 8/6/19 – Email to CCC members with the Meeting Notice, Agenda & Correspondence Report for this meeting • 17/6/19 – Email to CCC members with a reminder for this meeting. 	<p>Accepted.</p>
<p>6.0 Reports/Updates</p> <p>Stage 2 Presentation</p> <p>MB provided an update with a hard copy of the Stage 2 presentation provided to all attendees (see attached).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the modification process. • CWP working through response to submissions, expected to lodge with DP&E in the coming weeks. • DP&E will finalise its assessment report and refer to IPC, who will hold a public meeting as part of its consideration of the report. • There was a fairly even split between ‘for and against’, with the key issues being traffic, transport and the CEF. • There were some delays with agency submissions. • CWP has been consulting with Council regarding Stage 2 road dilapidation and maintenance program. • VP enquired whether local quarries would be used to source materials, raising concern about the spread of lovegrass. MB responded, advising that any material will be tested, wash-down areas would be put in place with a construction environmental management plan enacted to set out requirements. • The Proponent has committed to honour the \$80,000 community contributions regardless of how many WTGs are constructed in Stage 2. • There was a perception among submissions that the Modification would ‘short-change’ the community by reducing turbine numbers. The proponent has committed to contribute funds for each of the 32 WTG locations originally approved in Yandra (over \$80,000 (CPI adjusted) per annum for Stage 2) into existing CEF. <p>BRWF Stage 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AW advised of the current schedule for maintenance. • Major works occurred around Easter 2019 (two generator repairs). • Project roads have recently been regraded. • Heavily monitoring weeds and lovegrass 	<p>MB – announced that he is moving on from CWP; JP to be community liaison contact, working with Ed Mounsey. LA thanked MB for his professionalism and dedication in his work on the CCC, wishing him the best of luck in his future endeavours. Supported by all attendees with VP also expressing her thanks on behalf of NAG.</p> <p>CCC members expressed concern and importance of the construction and maintenance of local roads. JH asked if there was any construction proposed at Steeple Flat. The response was no. MB explained the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>FT commented that she wanted to finesse the language and clarified that the community thought that the simple effect of reducing WTG numbers, would reduce funding - not deliberately intended to suggest that the proponent was trying to short change the community.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle hygiene is a major concern and focus at the moment. • Half of the site is maintained by contractors and half by landowners. • Recruiting for positions at the moment. One FT role for an electrician has been advertised. • The wind farm is performing extremely well. AW provides a weekly report to EGCO. 	
<p>7.0 Community Concerns – No questions provided prior to the meeting.</p>	<p>Nil.</p>
<p>8.0 General Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VP – has received a few enquiries from members of the community regarding local jobs. • MB – once approved CWP we will work through financing and open expressions of interest. • The proponent will host community open days leading up to construction. • EPC contractors will drive the employment process, trades will be tendered locally, (local jobs are cheaper and it's a good outcome for the community). • The proponent will provide local content list and express preference for hiring locally where possible. • MB explained the experience on other CWP Renewables projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sapphire Wind Farm 50% workers were local ▪ Crudine Ridge Wind Farm used ICN organisation, which helps connect local business to tendering opportunities ▪ Bango Wind Farm taking same approach. • The community will be notified once work packages are ready to start (though still 1-2 years away). • SB – how will the wind farm compete with Snowy 2.0? • MB – Snowy is a demand centre and supply centre, not really competition, it is a battery. It would buy power from the wind farm and sell it. Snowy 2.0 expected increase capacity of network. Snowy 2.0 will compete directly with coal and gas. • MB – wind is the cheapest form of electricity (low operational expenditure). FT asked what makes wind energy cheaper. MB responded - due to ongoing fuel costs over the power stations life span. • <i>At 10:38am BG excused himself from the meeting.</i> • JH – expressed that this has been a good meeting. • HC advised that the Lions Club would be submitting a new application for the CEF to concrete the pathway at Lake William (\$35k). • AW – reminded CCC members to remind the community to submit their funding applications for next CEF round. Meetings will be held to assist applicants in filling in the forms (Tuesday & Thursday evening). 	
<p>9.0 Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday 17th September, (<i>FT advised that she will be an apology</i>) at the Nimmitabel Community Centre, commencing at 9am. 	<p>VP booked into Community Centre Calendar.</p>

Meeting closed 10.43pm with LA thanking all for their contribution and attendance.

Action Items:

Item	Issue	Action By:
1	Completion of Code of Conduct and Pecuniary/Non Pecuniary Forms	JP
2	Keep CCC informed of CEF outcomes	AW – Ongoing
3	Provide details of CEF expenditure and project finalised to date	SB
4	Copy of Charter for CEF to be provided to CCC members	VP/LA
5	Advise CCC when modification referred to IPC	JP/LA
6	CCC letter to CEF committee expressing CCC concerns and requesting review of Charter	LA
7	CWPR letter to Council reporting perception of community regarding CEF	JP