## **Action Items**

## **Collector Wind Farm Forum**

Date	2 December 2015		Time	6.30pm – Bushranger	Hotel, Collector	
Attende	ees					
Greg Smith (GS) Chair		Ja	mes McK	ay (JMcK)	Sharon Swincer (SS)	
Brian Mor (BM)		Jo	hn Hoskir	ns (JH)	Richard Stacy (RS)	
Martha Truelove (MT)		То	ny Walsh	ı (TW)	Mark Fleming (MF) (OEH)	
Anthony Yeates (AY) Ratch Australia		То	Tom Mitchell (TM) Ratch Australia			
01:						
Apologi	les					
Deborah Cameron (DC)						

No.	Action	Responsibility	Due Date
1	Welcome and apologies	Note	
	<ul> <li>Greg Smith explained his role as the Interim Chair in the absence of DC</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Given the number of new people at this meeting of the Committee (SS, RS, TM, MF, GS), a round of introductions was undertaken</li> </ul>		
2	Introductions, pecuniary interests, minutes from the last meeting		
	AY, TM: work for the Proponent.	Note	
	MT: has a pecuniary interest in the project		
	GS: paid by Proponent for his time as chair		
	<ul> <li>The Minutes of the July 23 meeting were reviewed. It was noted that correspondence from ULSC and JMcK referred to in those minutes was not attached. It was</li> </ul>		
	agreed this material would be circulated with the minutes of this meeting.		
	<ul> <li>Minutes of July 23 meeting were accepted as an accurate account of the meeting.</li> </ul>	Note	

3	Correspondence		
	<ul> <li>The memo from Ratch to ULSC and CCC concerning the Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) and the ULSC reply circulated with the meeting notice are listed for discussion at this meeting.</li> </ul>	Note	
4	Project update		
	<ul> <li>AY outlined the processes for Ratch's current application to the Department of Planning to modify the project approval. On doing that, they found that the Department has new performance indicators and timelines, which resulted in a very quick process.</li> <li>The Department manage public exhibition including timing and locations, they put the proposed amendments on public exhibition for 10 days. Following a request from the Community, the Department requested an additional hard copy be displayed in the village, which Ratch facilitated.</li> <li>51 submissions have been received (45 from individuals or groups). Ratch is now addressing those submissions and will seek to communicate directly with individuals.</li> <li>The timeline for Ratch responding to the Department of Planning under the new processes is very brief, and Ratch is unlikely to be able to meet that</li> </ul>	AY	ASAP
	<ul> <li>schedule.</li> <li>Ratch's goal is to send a response to the submissions the Department of Planning before Christmas.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>AY believes the stage will after that be a referral of the application to the PAC.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>JH indicated that it had been challenging to assess the public exhibition material by travelling to Crookwell, where it also was not in a very accessible location. It was also felt there should have been a CCC meeting while the document was on display.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>AY noted those views and apologised, indicating that Ratch had been surprised by the speed with which the Department moved.</li> </ul>	АУ	ASAP
	AY undertook to convey to the Department the need to provide more time for consultation. He also mentioned the number of contacts and information		

	sources Ratch had made available since April.	AY/DC	ASAP
	Members of this Committee who had made individual	AI/DC	ASAF
	submissions will get an individual response		
	Once the timeline and next steps are clear, AY will		
	circulate an email to the CCC, and provide		
	information on the Ratch website and via a		
	newsletter about those proposed next steps.		
5	Community Enhancement Fund (CEF)		
	AY briefly summarised the issues contained in the		
	correspondence, and general discussion occurred		
	around issues involved. Points addressed included :		
	<ul> <li>Ratch is satisfied that the legal status and</li> </ul>		
	operating procedures of GreaterGood meet		
	requirements for the CEF.		
	<ul> <li>Ratch doesn't share the Council's view of their</li> </ul>		
	requirement to manage the CEF.		
	<ul> <li>Ratch views the CCC as broadly representative of</li> </ul>		
	local opinion in addressing the issue of the best		
	structure for the CEF.	AY	ASAP
	<ul> <li>Ratch has sought advice from the Department of</li> </ul>		
	Planning on any potential for it to be involved in	AY	ASAP
	resolving the issues. However they had indicated		
	their preference that the developer find a		
	potential solution.		
	<ul> <li>Ratch is concerned it has been unable to have a</li> </ul>		
	more considered discussion with the Council.		
	<ul> <li>Initial consideration has been given to a possible</li> </ul>		
	option to ask the PAC to resolve this issue if		
	necessary.		
	JMcK indicated he had located information which		
	suggested that as early as October 2014 ULSC may		
	have established a formal committee under Section		
	355 of their legislation, to manage the proposed CEF.		
	Points arising from the discussion included:		
	<ul> <li><u>CCC</u> members recognise that structure as similar</li> </ul>		
	to that used to manage the ULSC support for the		
	Pumpkin Festival.		
	<ul> <li>AY indicated he did not know this structure existed</li> </ul>	INACK	۸۵۸۵
		JMcK	ASAP

	either.		
-	As Council representatives choose not to attend CCC meetings, it is not possible to seek information from them directly about this apparent development, or any other aspect of the issue.		
_	JMcK has written to ULSC seeking details of this issue and will advise the CCC of any response.		
t fı	mmittee members reported on a public meeting hey had organised in their community to discuss the uture structure of the CEF. While ULSC had been nvited, they declined to attend. Outcomes included  The meeting had become more of a discussion about the whole Project, why the CCC exists and		
_	why the representatives are on it.  As a result, the future CEF was unable to be discussed in detail. However, Committee members present at the community meeting indicated there was a strong consensus that the ULSC should have nothing to do with managing the future funds.		
S	F provided some background about similar tructures and processes in place in other levelopment projects elsewhere in the State.		
ti ri	e discussion then turned to what the CCC could do o establish a genuine conversation with ULSC. A ange of potential future actions were canvassed and wo were agreed to be taken as soon as possible.	JMcK/DC	ASAP
(1	i) JMcK will draft ideas expressing the Committee's desire to meet with ULSC to discuss their limited engagement in the whole project, and specifically the divergence of opinion over the form and structure of the future CEF. The draft correspondence will be provided to DC to finalise and send to the Council on behalf of the CCC;	АҮ	ASAP
(i	ii) AY was asked to make some initial investigations into possible alternative dispute resolution		

	processes should that avenue become		
	necessary, for potential consideration by the		
	CCC at its next meeting.		
6	Other business		
	Arising from the community meeting mentioned		
	above, TW expressed the view that the minutes of		
	CCC Meetings need to be circulated in hard copy		
	form via either the mail or as an attachment to the		
	Gunning Lions Newsletter.		
	This is because the Internet connection available to		
	local community members is very limited, and it is		
	anyway their preference to have hardcopy material.		
	<ul> <li>The Committee agreed that this was a desirable way to</li> </ul>		
	proceed. It was agreed that draft minutes need to be		
	circulated by email to the CCC Members soon after		
	each meeting, with a period of one week provided		
	for any variations to be raised. Once that week was		
	passed, the minutes would be assumed to be a	AV / D.C.	
	correct record and able to be available for	AY / DC	
	distribution.		
	<ul> <li>It was reported that there had been discussion at the</li> </ul>		
	community meeting concerning research in the		
	United States addressing the potential impact of		
	wind turbines on birds and bats. AY undertook to		
	investigate this further to see if the material can be	AY	
	readily located provided to the committee.		
	<ul> <li>Committee members asked that their personal best</li> </ul>		
	wishes be passed on to DC	GS	
	·		
	The meeting finished at 8:20 PM.		
8	Next meeting		
	It was agreed the next meeting would be held in the first		
	week in February 2016, AY and DC to consult about specific	AY/DC to	
	dates once the result of the modification process outlined	consult	
	above is known.		

Signature:	
Name: Greg Smith, Independent Chair – KJA	
Date:	