

Action Items

Collector Wind Farm Forum

Date	2 December 2015	Time	6.30pm – Bushranger Hotel, Collector
-------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------------------------------

Attendees

Greg Smith (GS) Chair	James McKay (JMck)	Sharon Swincer (SS)
Brian Mor (BM)	John Hoskins (JH)	Richard Stacy (RS)
Martha Truelove (MT)	Tony Walsh (TW)	Mark Fleming (MF) (OEH)
Anthony Yeates (AY) Ratch Australia	Tom Mitchell (TM) Ratch Australia	

Apologies

Deborah Cameron (DC)		
----------------------	--	--

No.	Action	Responsibility	Due Date
1	Welcome and apologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greg Smith explained his role as the Interim Chair in the absence of DC Given the number of new people at this meeting of the Committee (SS, RS, TM, MF, GS), a round of introductions was undertaken 	Note	
2	Introductions, pecuniary interests, minutes from the last meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AY, TM: work for the Proponent. MT: has a pecuniary interest in the project GS: paid by Proponent for his time as chair 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 agreed this material would be circulated with the minutes of this meeting. Minutes of July 23 meeting were accepted as an accurate account of the meeting. 	<p>Note</p> <p>GS/DC</p> <p>Note</p>	

	<p>sources Ratch had made available since April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of this Committee who had made individual 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. 	AY/DC	ASAP
5	<p>Community Enhancement Fund (CEF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AY briefly summarised the issues contained in the correspondence, and general discussion occurred around issues involved. Points addressed included : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ratch is satisfied that the legal status and operating procedures of GreaterGood meet requirements for the CEF. – Ratch doesn't share the Council's view of their requirement to manage the CEF. – Ratch views the CCC as broadly representative of local opinion in addressing the issue of the best structure for the CEF. – Ratch has sought advice from the Department of Planning on any potential for it to be involved in resolving the issues. However they had indicated their preference that the developer find a potential solution. – Ratch is concerned it has been unable to have a more considered discussion with the Council. – Initial consideration has been given to a possible 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 style="list-style-type: none"> – CCC members recognise that structure as similar to that used to manage the ULSC support for the Pumpkin Festival. – AY indicated he did not know this structure existed 	<p>AY</p> <p>AY</p> <p>JMCK</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p>ASAP</p>

	<p>either.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. • Committee members reported on a public meeting they had organised in their community to discuss the future structure of the CEF. While ULSC had been invited, they declined to attend. Outcomes included <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. • MF provided some background about similar structures and processes in place in other development projects elsewhere in the State. • The discussion then turned to what the CCC could do to establish a genuine conversation with ULSC. A range of potential future actions were canvassed and two were agreed to be taken as soon as possible. <p>(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;</p> <p>(ii) AY was asked to make some initial investigations into possible alternative dispute resolution</p>	<p>JMCK/DC</p> <p>AY</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>ASAP</p>
--	--	--------------------------	-------------------------

	processes should that avenue become necessary, for potential consideration by the CCC at its next meeting.		
6	Other business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The Committee agreed that this was a desirable way to 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 correct record and able to be available for distribution. • It was reported that there had been discussion at the 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 readily located provided to the committee. • Committee members asked that their personal best wishes be passed on to DC • The meeting finished at 8:20 PM. 	<p>AY / DC</p> <p>AY</p> <p>GS</p>	
8	Next meeting <p>It was agreed the next meeting would be held in the first week in February 2016, AY and DC to consult about specific dates once the result of the modification process outlined above is known.</p>	AY/DC to consult	

Meeting action items endorsed by:

Signature:

Name: Greg Smith, Independent Chair – KJA

Date: