

**MEETING No 6
MINUTES**

**Kyoto Energy Park
Kyoto Community Forum**

Location: Upper Hunter Shire Council Offices

Date: 9 November 2016

Time: 2:30pm

Attendees and Distribution:

Chair Daryl Dutton (Apology)

Local Residents Judy Wheeler
Gordon Halliday
Trevor Woolley
Peter Hale (Apology)

Upper Hunter Shire Council Cr. Wayne Bedggood
Sean Constable

Chamber of Commerce Ben Wyndham (Apology)

Proponent Mark Sydney
Alan Wong
Mark Dixon

Observers

Office of Heritage Gordon Fraser (Apology)
Upper Hunter Shire Council Matt Pringle (Paul Smith attended on behalf)
Resident / Landowner Allan Henderson (Apology)

Copies sent to: Project Website
Department of Planning (Sydney)
Department of Planning (Singleton)

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
1. Apologies / Structure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Members 	<p>Allan Henderson</p> <p>(The committee agreed that Allan Henderson (the landowner and a project stakeholder) may attend the meetings purely as an observer. If prior to a meeting a member of the committee requests that Mr Henderson should not attend the forthcoming meeting on grounds that the subject material for discussion is of a sensitive nature then this will be considered by the committee prior to the meeting.)</p>	Noted
	<p>Alan Wong</p> <p>(Alan is the newest team member within Pamada to be dedicated to the Project. Alan is managing the commercial documentation for the project and attends the meetings in support of Mark Dixon and Mark Sydney)</p>	Noted

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies 	Daryl Dutton Peter Hale Gordon Fraser Allan Henderson	Noted Contact to be made with Ben Wyndham
2. Declarations of Interests		
Anything to declare?	KCF	Nothing to declare
3. Confirmation of previous Minutes		
3.1. Minutes of Meeting No.5	KCF	Noted
4. Actions Arising from last meeting (Meeting No. 5)		
4.1. Pamada will put the minutes from all meetings and all general updates on the project website.	Complete	Noted. Pamada's update of website an ongoing process
4.2. Comments on CEMP Stage 1 – Site Compound received from the Dept of Planning and Environment (DPE) in Dec 2015.	After discussion with the Department, yet a new version of the CEMP will resubmitted – with the likely timing being March 2017. Further discussion at the meeting.	Timing of CEMP noted and that DPE stated a preference in the last instance for a consolidated CEMP to be submitted rather than by stages.
5. Correspondence		
5.1. General Public – Generally	Nothing to report	Noted
5.2. General Public – Work	Nothing to report	Noted
5.3. General Public – KCF	Nothing to report	Noted
5.4. Government Generally	Nothing to report	
5.5. KCF Committee Members	<p>Ms Wheeler has asked the proponent to comment on the Decommissioning of the Turbines on completion.</p> <p>A condition of the Approval requires the proponent to provide evidence to the Department of Planning that there is a provision in the Land Owner Agreement to decommission the turbines at the end of the agreement period on the land.</p> <p>We have provided this (confidential) detail and the Department has written back to us confirming we have satisfied the requirement.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, for the avoidance of doubt, over the life of the project, it is possible to refresh technology on the</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Judy Wheeler ran through her list of queries on topic.</p> <p>In response, MS gave confirmation on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an appropriate decommissioning reserve would kept by the Proponent and the requirement has been built into the landowner agreement with the clause accepted by DPE. - If a new owner were to come into the project, the decommissioning funding would be preserved. - The decommissioning amount would be built up over

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
	site, that will at all times the project be subject to the conditions of the Approval.	time and might be a combination of different financial instruments, performance guarantees and/or funds. - continuous independent review on the adequacy of the decommissioning reserve over the lifetime of the project is provided for.
	<p>Mr Woolley asked the proponent to comment on the NSW Wind Guidelines</p> <p>We attach the Wind Energy Guidelines, which were issued as Draft by the Department in August 2016.</p> <p>As the project has approval, these new guidelines do not apply to our project.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the draft guidelines is in the form of an Assessment Policy, that refers to Visual Assessment and Noise Assessment Bulletins.</p> <p>It is noted, that prior to this, NSW did also have a Draft Wind Guideline (ca 2004) that never made it passed the Draft stage.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss this further at the meeting.</p>	<p>The details of the new NSW Wind Guidelines were noted. Confirmation and acceptance that the project will only be subject to the approval conditions already provided.</p> <p>MS did note the comments from Gordon Halliday and Cr. Bedggood that consideration should be given to the new guidelines and its approach in the context of the project even if they did not officially apply.</p> <p>Judy Wheeler detailed that some aspects of the new guidelines were less stringent than the assessment completed under the Project Approval however, the new guidelines did include a more involved process with the community to mitigate any issues prior to DPE submission.</p> <p>MS agreed to comment further at the next Forum meeting.</p>
5.6. Department of Planning and Environment – community committee	Nothing to report	Noted
5.7. Department of Planning and Environment – compliance	Routine communication with no actions arising	Noted
5.8. Press – Communications	Nothing to report	Noted
5.9. Press – General	None noted by the proponent	Noted
5.10. Website	Kyoto website will be updated with new updates as news emerges, however, the overhaul is further delayed.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Judy Wheeler noted that links to the new NSW Wind Guideline framework should be included on the website.</p>

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
6. Project Report		
6.1. Progress of the project – assessment or operational issues		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally 	<p>In general terms since the last KCF meeting the project's focus has been:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To identify possible off-take arrangements for the electricity; 2. Identify possible financial partners partners to bring the project to reality; and 3. Clarify the Department's requirements for completion of the CEMP <p>All three matters will be addressed in more detail at the meeting for the interest of the Forum Members</p>	MS outlined to the Forum the latest progress with the matters.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Industry Issues / Macro-Economic Environment 	<p>By the time of the meeting, the US Election results may well have been decided, or perhaps by the end of the Community Forum meeting.</p> <p>A Trump victory is expected to have some impact on certainty for investment. Notwithstanding, global interest in owning wind and solar farms is greater than ever before. The number of global players seeking to own renewable energy assets is significant.</p> <p>Renewable Energy is globally seen as one of the more stable and reliable forms of investment.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the interest, the main blockage for progression of projects is access to funding and funding generally is conditional upon the guaranteed sale of the electricity generated by the projects. Accordingly reverse auction pricing from those such as the ACT Government have meant that the cost to supply renewably generated electricity comes at an all time low. Great buying/business for those entities such as the ACT Government who have locked in their 20 years of future energy at a discount to coal.</p> <p>As a backup, gas and coal still have their place as was proven with the South Australian blackouts last month, but renewables are going to provide the bulk of new electricity. We would be happy to discuss the South Australian blackouts.</p>	Noted

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
	In NSW the greatest cost of electricity to the home or business remains the network and government charges, not the cost of creating the electricity itself.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology Supplies 	Nothing new to report, albeit better technologies available.	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finance Availability 	<p>Even more access to project finance exists compared to the comments from the last meeting.</p> <p>Numerous major banks in Australia are offering project finance based on spot pricing alone providing projects such as Kyoto Energy Park access to funding solutions even in the absence of a PPA.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Australian Banks and large Super Funds have not kept up with global investment and finance availability in the sector. Current funding windows are too short to enable longer term finance needs for renewable energy projects.</p> <p>A further update will be provided at the meeting.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>MS confirmed that financial close will be likely in 2017 with in principle agreement by end of 2016.</p> <p>Trevor Woolley and Gordon Halliday questioned the timeframes the project would be working towards. MS commented that the plan was in Q1 2017 would be when detailed plans will be provided and discussed and CEMP is hoped to be re-submitted by February 2017. Then construction to commence in around mid-year 2017 with civil works (which would take approximately 9 months) prior to turbine order and arrival by Q2 2018. Confirmation to Trevor Woolley that the Community Forum would be engaged again prior to construction commencement or turbine delivery.</p> <p>Judy Wheeler commented on the need for micro-siting and reviewing the noise assessments based on the chosen turbine technology.</p> <p>MS also commented that there is no plan to modify and expand on the solar component of the project past the current 10MW and that technology for the hydro needs to improve prior to any further consideration of its inclusion, but that there is a hope to locate more solar in the hidden bowl of the project site.</p>
6.2. Issues arising from site inspections	Nothing to report	Noted

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
6.3. Monitoring and performance	Nothing to report	Noted
6.4. Community complaints and response	None received to the project	Noted
6.5. Information provided to the community and any feedback	Nothing to report	
6.6. Other relevant Information	Nothing to report	
4. General Business / Other		<p>Sean Constable requested that the project consider ways of connecting with the local community to provide employment and reskilling opportunities.</p> <p>Cr Bedggood encouraged Pamada to consider putting a requirement in the terms of reference or employment and training framework to give preference for local workers for project positions with all else being equal (e.g. experience, skills and location).</p> <p>MS confirmed it would not make sense for the project to source services and skills other than local when it would be of benefit to the community as well as the more logical solution to the development and/or operation. However, it is noted that the suppliers to the project may be subject to their minimum performance levels and any engagement with local businesses/workers will be subject to local tender processes.</p> <p>Action: Pamada to look to running workshops with local businesses to educate them on the project requirements</p>
5. Next Meeting		
Suggested Thursday 16 th March 2017 at 2.30pm?		Noted and agreed
6. Other General Tracking Items		
We have simplified the standing questions and thought a tracking each meeting may assist	[remains repeated unless in bold]	

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The position of the sub station 	Still likely near Moobi Plateau, well away from Bunnan Rd.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 turbines on Middlebrook 	No new update in this regard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 turbines on Middlebrook (power lines) 	No new update in this regard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power route generally 	Unfortunately the route remains confidential and will unlikely be public information for some months.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport route for heavy vehicles and machinery 	No new update in this regard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road dilapidation Surveys 	Relevant Dilapidation Surveys will occur prior to relevant stages of construction.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bird & Bat Monitoring – Condition 3.3. 	The approval of the Plan is ongoing and not final at the time of writing. The Plan, once approved, shall be placed on the website.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flora & Fauna Impacts: Condition 2.18. Has the compensatory habitat package been agreed 	The approval of the Plan is ongoing and not final at the time of writing. The Plan, once approved, shall be placed on the website.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turbines on Mountain Station: 	<p>It is likely that the total number of turbines reduce, but not certain at this time.</p> <p>Should the number reduce, it is highly likely, distances from neighbours will remain generally similar, but more than likely they will be slightly further away.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solar or Turbines first? If you decide to put the solar in first (and I hope you do) then this again could mean different turbine technology when the time comes. 	Discussions with all possible finance partners share the hope to undertake the solar and wind simultaneously.	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to the various stages of construction and to be fair considering the financial situation, the RET etc. if you don't want to put a definite date on each stage then I guess that would be OK. Perhaps an indicative date. It can always be updated later. I guess the most important thing is to get the above answers to the questions covered and the general plan as to what each stage would comprise of. 	Happy to discuss this further at the meeting	Noted

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further KCF members. 	Nothing new to report	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is noted that the construction of the hydro component of the KEP and the manager's residence has not been mentioned in the 4 construction stages. Please advise if these are going ahead and at what stage they intend to be constructed. 	Both are likely Stage 4 works.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inspection of Mountain Station 	Agreed, it would be more beneficial after completion of Stage 1 and Pamada to arrange at that time.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website 	Part of full rebuild	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solar Update 	<p>We are looking at all options with regard – existing location, modified location, and additional locations</p> <p>We are currently progressing with the same location for the 10MW that has approval.</p> <p>We may seek approval for further capacity once the Wind and first 10MW of solar is locked in.</p>	Noted
<p>Note from Sean Constable regarding lighting for aviation purposes.</p> <p>Aviation Impacts A request from Sean Constable (UHSC) was received in relation to possible lighting treatment of turbines at night and associated impacts. Since approval in 2010 the Scone airport has now been classified as a 'scheduled airport' with general queries raised for any additional lighting requirements. These may be applicable as a result of the change.</p> <p>In accordance with the Kyoto Conditions of Consent and during the design phase, Pamada will engage a CASA approved specialist consultant to prepare and submit an 'Aviation Risk Assessment' to CASA for approval. The Aviation Risk Assessment will need to include a Lighting Treatment for delineation of the windfarm at night. The</p>	<p>Joanne McLoughlin requested that Council be consulted on during the preparation of the Aviation Risk Assessment prior to commencement of construction. In accordance with the Conditions of consent Pamada are required to consult directly with CASA on the use of Aviation lighting prior to commencement of construction and in consultation with them develop an approved lighting plan for the wind turbines.</p> <p>Mark Sydney agreed that any advice and help that Council could offer on the level and appropriateness of aviation lighting would be in the interests of all parties. Ms McLoughlin also mentioned that Council had previously used the services of an OLS Surveyor/Risk Assessor that could also provide specific advice and comments.</p> <p>Action: Consult with Council Aviation officers and assessors during preparation of the Aviation Risk Assessment.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Discussion and outline on the issues to Trevor Woolley.</p> <p>MS confirmed the project will work with CASA to come to an agreement and solution to any lighting requirement for the wind turbines.</p> <p>Judy Wheeler stated there may be a solution to having the lighting on the ground to clearly outline the boundaries to the project rather than on top of the wind tubrines.</p>

Report Items	Comment from KEP	Action/ Comment
<p>assessment will look at proximity of the windfarm to the airport, flight paths, terrain, emergency procedures amongst other things. No turbines are allowed within certified airspace.</p> <p>While this is the case due to the relative close proximity of the airport some lighting is likely to be a design requirement. Mitigation measures do exist for limiting visibility of lighting in some cases, however this is not at the expense of aviation safety.</p> <p>Final approval is subject to CASA.</p> <p>The current guidelines adopted by CASA for assessment of aviation risks is attached – National Airports Safeguarding Framework- Managing the Risk to Aviation Safety.....Towers.</p> <p>As the progress on micro-siting continues, pamada and its consultant will develop a strategy for discussion with CASA. At this point in time it is too early.</p>		
Other Issues for discussion?		