

res Minutes of Barneys Reef Wind Farm

Community Consultative Committee

Monday 30 January 2023, Gulgong RSL Club
Gulgong

Present:

Garry West (GW)	Independent Chairperson
Darren Chesterfield (DC)	Community Engagement Manager, RES
Grant Gjessing (GG)	Community Representative
Peter Willis (PW)	Gulgong Chamber of Commerce
David Menchin (DM)	Community Representative
Eleanor Cairns (EC)	Development Project Manager, RES
Brad Bliss(online) (BB)	Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation
Leanne Ryan (online) (LR)	Warrumbungle Shire Council
Michelle Croker (online)	Umwelt
Nikolai Liu (online) (NL)	Observer

Apologies:

Jack Pennell (JP)	Warabinga Native Title Claimants
Cr Dale Hogden (online) (DH)	Warrumbungle Shire Council
Cr Paul Cavalier (PC)	Mid Western Regional Council

Meeting Commenced 5:40pm

1. Welcome & Introductions

GW- Thanks everyone for your attendance, and apologies for technology issues with the online connection. Acknowledgement of Country, welcomed attendees both present and online. Introduced Michelle Croker from Umwelt who will introduce a presentation on Industry and Aboriginal Participation Plan and Nikolai Lui, a neighbour to the project as an observer.

2. Apologies: as above

3. Declarations of Pecuniary / Conflict of Interest

No new declarations

4. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Previous minutes had been circulated and agreed and uploaded to the project website.

5. Correspondence:
NIL

6. Proponents Report

Project Update

EC: Presentation commences. Ellie provided project update.

EC: Since we last spoke, there's been quite a lot of work done on the EIS. Cultural heritage test pitting program ran over 6 weeks. Received draft reports or results on various other surveys. Whilst we haven't seen the full report for all studies, we do have preliminary results. By next meeting we should be almost to the point where we are submitting the EIS. I'll now go through the results.

EC: Aviation Assessment – We've had no issues come out of the assessment, which has been good. There were two aircraft landing areas, one to the south and one to the north. There were concerns of wake impact. The suggestions I that the Gulgong landing area is there is no impact. To the northern airstrip, there may be a small impact, however the owner of the northern runway does not use that runway anymore. Not required to have aviation lighting on turbines.

EC: EMI/EMF and Blade Throw assessment. The only thing that came up in assessments, we needed to move 4 turbines. They need to be 99.5m from project boundary of project – the largest turbine shift was 8m. It is not likely to have impact to generation of the project. Low impact from EMI and EMF.

PW: Can you define EMI/EMF

EC: EMI is Electro Magnetic Interference and EMF is Electro Magnetic Frequency

EC: Next steps for EMI/EMF assessment, consult with the community and include in the EIS.

EC: Noise and vibration – we've had background noise monitoring done at 9 locations in the project. Most were un-associated dwellings. Worst case wind scenarios are modelled to identify criteria the project must meet. In certain wind conditions (high wind speeds) there would likely need to be some mitigations (constraining of turbines) or we would come to an agreement with neighbours around noise.

GW: Do they have to be turned off or just turned down?

EC: I would think they could be slowed and not turned off

DM: Is it true that in really high wind speeds turbines would need to be turned off?

EC: occasionally, but it's unlikely for this project due to the wind profile

EC: noise contour image shown. We are aiming for everyone to be outside of the area of non-compliance. There are numerous factors to consider, wind speed, turbines used etc.

PW: I've noticed sometimes when we get strong winds it's the signal that we are going to get rain

EC: Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA): We haven't received the report for the visual impact assessment yet. What has come out is some results. We completed another round of field surveys last month, took images for assessing. We have a number of properties that we're going to be looking to enter into neighbour agreements with. These will be for those properties identified where the impact is high. We are starting these conversations now. Unlikely that we need to enter into neighbour agreements prior to DA, but these conversations should be progressed.

EC: Hydrology: Our consultants modelled a 1 in 500 year event. No impact to infrastructure identified. Importantly we look at where our substations are, and then the turbines. Once we get into detailed design we'll look a little more at erosion and sediment control, but that will be down the line.

EC: Biodiversity: All field surveys are complete. A number of threatened species and one threatened community has been identified. Our first preference is to avoid. If this isn't possible, we minimise impact. There will be more detail in the report on exact impact to which habitats and ecological communities when it comes out, as well as detail on mitigation and our biodiversity offset credit amount.

PW: What is a threatened ecological community.

DC: An ecological community is a naturally occurring group of native plants, animals and other organisms that are interacting in a unique habitat. Its structure, composition and distribution are determined by environmental factors such as soil type, position in the landscape, altitude, climate and water availability. (DCCEEW 2021)

<https://www.dcceew.gov.au/environment/biodiversity/threatened/communities>

EC: we will circulate to the group the like area of disturbance to the threatened ecological communities once the report is released in mid-late February.

EC: Archaeology: 6 weeks of test excavations. 1500 artefacts were recovered. BB was part of that work and may have things to add.

BB: Field officers were out there, they did a lot of digging. Unsure of what exactly came out.

EC: We're expecting our report from Umwelt in the next 2-3 weeks

EC: That's all from the results of assessments. In terms of timeline, our DA should be going in at the start of April. Looking to get to a point to start construction in July 2024.

GW: We should try to manage the next CCC for just prior to DA submission

EC: Sounds good. We can bring along our EIS consultants. Now to Darren for a community update.

Tallawang Solar Farm Update

DC: Overview provided of the status of the Tallawang solar project. 54 objections including councils and Native Title Claimant. Next steps are to draft responses to submissions and be guided by DPE through evaluation process, possibly leading to IPC.

Benefit Sharing Update

DC: Overview of ongoing consultation provided. RES is currently seeking feedback on the final design of the proposed Barneys Reef project, as well as proposals for community benefit from both projects. Information sessions are to be held throughout February, and consultation continues with key stakeholders about benefit sharing arrangements and ongoing assessments.

Industry and Aboriginal Participation Plan

DC: introduction to Michelle Croker from Umwelt and the Industry and Aboriginal Participation Plan (IAPP) work piece.

MC: Thanks Darren. Does anybody want to understand an IAPP for the project?

GW: I think that would be useful

MC: Introduced Workforce Accommodation Strategy, SIA, and IAPP as areas where Umwelt is supporting the projects. There's connectivity between that work. This project is put into AEMO tender. What that means is there are stringent requirements around local participation. MC provided overview of specific pillars of the plan.

MC: NSW government hasn't put out baseline requirements for the Q2 Access Tender. They were very high in the first round.

MC: In order to deliver on the IAPP, there has to be partnerships. There has to be arrangements made as to how you meet those targets. The IAPP will evolve into an IAPP delivery plan. That's the work we're doing. Are there any quick questions about that?

GG: There's not a strong Aboriginal community here in our local demographic. Is that something you've picked up in your assessments? How will multiple projects have a limited amount of Aboriginals participate?

MC: We're looking at it from more of a regional perspective. Some are not based in a nearby town, but there'll be in the area.

GJ: How does that satisfy the need for local engagement and participating in the project?

MC: If they are local First Nations businesses they will have an opportunity. NSW Government does not have a definition of local – it is just Australia or NZ. The response from most communities is that they want a local focus. RES is focussing on local businesses as part of their work.

MC: What Aboriginal businesses are doing is picking up young people who are looking for opportunities. That's where the IAPP can be valuable.

BB: CEO of a local First Nations company. A lot of lands councils have guys who can work machinery. At Bodangora, there were 6 identified staff who work locally and abroad at other wind projects.

MC: We're working with established government and NGO programs, but local organisations are critical in getting the information out there. The good thing with the IAPP is these targets are binding. Opportunities must transform to people on the ground. There's lots of work that needs to be done but it's possible.

BB: With the other demographics (underrepresented etc.) there's an employment group called APM in Mudgee. Opposite Shell service station. They service disabled people for employment.

MC: I've got a list here of all recruitment agencies that crossover here. I'd welcome any other suggestions or leads. We work by word of mouth.

MC: Skillset have also been helpful in CWO projects for helping people find work from underrepresented groups.

GG: So there's no actual requirement for local content if there's no definition of local?

MC: For EPCs and major contractors, this is a requirement across the board. They are very aware of social procurement requirements. This is becoming a requirement across the board.

MC: Regarding the local part, we are contacting all contractors from closest towns. We have a really good understanding of who is in the area locally. There has to be local opportunities for the project or else the project won't be supported.

DM: Can you please clarify, if there are approx. 380 people employed on the job. Are we talking about people that don't have to be on site, but could be working remotely such as in offices abroad. Are we talking about underrepresented groups employed onsite.

EC: The number MC was referring to means onsite people, however some of the criteria relating to underrepresented groups does apply to those involved in the project across the project timeline.

GW: and 380 is total?

EC: Correct, that our best approximation at the moment. We'd have a peak workforce of 245 at any one time

PW: does construction include roadworkers

EC: Internal roads, absolutely. External roads, it would depend on the agreement we reach with council.

7. General Business

NIL

8. Actions: Presentations to be uploaded to project website

9. Next Meeting

GW: Next meeting, I suggest in the next 3 months, though we should be mindful of the DA submission and should seek to have our next meeting just prior to the submission.

Meeting close: 6:30pm.