



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: POTTINGER WIND FARM (SSD-59235464)

EDWARD RIVER COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL: RICHARD PEARSON (CHAIR)
MICHAEL WRIGHT
SARAH DINNING

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON
GEOFF KWOK

SPEAKERS: CR LEANNE MULHAM
JACK BOND
MARK DALZELL
SIMONE HUGHES
MARIE SUTTON
MADDISON GUNTER

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 9:30AM – 10:30AM
WEDNESDAY, 28 MAY 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR RICHARD PEARSON: OK, good. Let me just start by acknowledging that I'm speaking to you today from Yuin land, and acknowledge the Traditional Owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today, and pay my respects to Elders past and present.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Pottinger Wind Farm, SSD59235464, currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant, Pottinger Renewables, a joint venture between AGL Energy and Someva Renewables, proposed to develop a 1,300-megawatt wind farm located approximately 60 kilometres south of Hay within the Hay Shire and Edward River local government areas in the South West Renewable Energy Zone.

The project involves the development of up to 247 turbines with a maximum tip height of 280 metres, a 500-megawatt battery energy storage system, connection to the Project EnergyConnect transmission line, which is currently under construction, and other ancillary infrastructure.

My name is Richard Pearson, I'm Chair of this Commission panel, and I'm joined by fellow Commissioners Sarah Dinning and Michael Wright. We are also joined by Jane Anderson and Geoff Kwok from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter, and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It is important for Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and clarify issues whenever considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and not able to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website.

I request all members here today please introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

We'll now begin. I'm just going to ask each member from Council to just please introduce yourself, and if applicable, provide any verbal declaration being actual or potential personal interests that you may have in the project. And we do have an agenda for today's meeting, which is actually opening statement, which I've done, Council introductions and declarations of interest. And then for the Council to provide a brief overview of any points that it would like the Commission to consider coming from its submission previously made, or any other matters you think the Commission should have front of mind when considering this application. Then we'll talk through some detailed matters that we have on the

agenda. So I'm going to, with that, pass it over to Council to please make some introductions.

5 **MR JACK BOND:** Yeah. Hi everyone. Jack Bond, I'm the CEO of Edward River Council and I'll pass to Mark Dalzell.

10 **MR MARK DALZELL:** Yeah, thanks Jack. Yeah, Mark Dalzell, Director of Infrastructure here at Council. So my portfolio includes the development services planning side, and also the infrastructure side of Council's activities. So very much in both those areas, interfacing with the development.

Just on mute there, Marie, sorry.

15 **MS MARIE SUTTON:** Unmuted. Marie Sutton, Manager of Development Services. So managing the planning side of these issues.

MS MADDISON GUNTER: Maddison Gunter, Town Planner here at Council.

20 **MS SIMONE HUGHES:** Simone Hughes, Acting Manager, Community and Economy.

CR LEANNE MULHAM: Leanne Mullen, just a new Councillor, just learning the ropes and what goes on, and representing the residents, I assume.

25 **MR PEARSON:** Good. Is there anyone else from Council or is that the full contingent?

MR DALZELL: No, that's us from Council, thanks, Richard.

30 **MR PEARSON:** OK, excellent. And as I did introduce, we have fellow Commissioners, Michael Wright and Sarah Dinning on the coverage today. So did you, Jack or Mark or others, want to just briefly talk through any issues that Council has with the project that you would like to bring to the Commission's attention, or do you want us to just jump into the specific agenda that we've got?

35 **MR DALZELL:** I'll just pass it on. Marie Sutton, she's been coordinating, so her and Maddie have done a lot of work in terms of our submission. So without throwing Marie under the bus, I'll just pass on to her in terms of just our submission. But then, yeah, because I think with your agenda, you'll come across the main points that we have. If we don't pick them up there, we can pick them up at the end.

MR PEARSON: Sure. OK, thanks, Mark. Yep, over to you, Marie.

45 **MS SUTTON:** Yep. So we did a response back in May in regard to the submission response. So that probably covered where we were up to. Our main issues were waste, management of waste, and having a good waste management plan in place. It's very general. Our tips aren't really equipped to receive the waste

that's going to be generated. And the fact that we will also have multiple projects maybe happening at the same time is a concern. So we really want more solid waste arrangements so we know that that's not going to become an issue.

5 We noted at the time when we did our response that there was no assessment, or no conditions had been developed for noise and vibration, for visual, for air, for biodiversity or for heritage. So we couldn't really make any comments on that. So it was deficient in that area, that those conditions hadn't been drafted.

10 In relation to bushfire hazard and fire management, there's very little that's really been dealt with that, both onsite firefighting management and also the issue we have with these areas being remote. There's no ability or there's little ability for quick response times. So we think – and fires can get very easily out of control. So we're very concerned that there needs to be more done to address that. And that
15 may be through emergency plans, or through a lot more onsite facilities to fight first attack sort of fire management.

20 There's quite a few issues about transport and road upgrades and things, which I think I would let Mark touch on those, because they're more specific to roads, which I don't have a big handle on, but there's certainly upgrade of roads and making sure the haulage routes are worked out, and the timing of vehicle movements is crucial so it's not impacting on local road users and also school buses and things like that, that are in the area.

25 VPA, there was an issue with the VPA, which Simone will probably need to talk about, because it was, there was some anomalies in there with all the community funds being used within 20 k's of the actual community, which is very remote areas, and it didn't seem a good way to distribute those funds to get the best community benefit.

30 And worker healthcare arrangements, which is probably unusual, but we have a high shortage of medical, general practitioners and health services in Edward River Council area. And just the provision of maybe some onsite health services in the accommodation camps and things like that would assist, because it would be a
35 huge strain on our current healthcare. They were probably our main concerns.

MR PEARSON: That's really useful. Thank you. So did, can I just pick up that requirement to use the VPA funds within 20 k's of the site? Is that still a
40 requirement, do you know?

MS HUGHES: Where we're – sorry, it's Simone, did you want me to talk about parts?

MS SUTTON: Yes, please.

45 **MS HUGHES:** Only the parts that I know. We haven't actually entered into a VPA with Pottinger yet. We got to a stage where we agreed to exchange a letter of intent. So I think we still have the opportunity to actually ensure that the detail in

any agreements are in line with the framework and the guidelines. So yeah, I think there's still that opportunity for us to – there's still a lot of engagement we need to do with our local community, and not just the community, around the project. Obviously there's the flow-on to the extended community as well. And we also need to be getting a really firm sort of position within Council around those things.

So I think there's opportunity there. Marie, Mark, or Jack, if you wanted to jump in at all. But we did have that protection in place, until we knew we'd get to this point, where the possibility of the project would get access and get to this point, I suppose, in the planning system that we did want to just have a letter of intent, having a bit of a guide around where the proponent had spoke to communities locally about where they'd like to see funds go, such as the division between First Nations and so on. Yeah. So that's the point we're up to there.

MR PEARSON: OK. Well, thank you. Yeah. I wasn't aware of that 20-kilometre restriction, I have to say, in discussions we've had with the applicant. I don't know if it still stands, but I don't necessarily see the necessity for that. I would have thought you could acquit the funds across the local government area, subject to a process. But yeah. Fellow Commissioners, was there –

MS HUGHES: I could do some more research on that too – sorry to cut you off there. I think, yeah, I can put some more background to that and provide that as required.

MR PEARSON: Yeah. I think that would be useful for us to understand any issues that you have with the proposed VPA. And we are aware that it's not been entered into at this stage and that it remains an offer. I think it's also worth discussing that the amount, which I think is under offer, is per megawatt. So that will be dependent on, as you probably know, I think they have access rights for 832.1, it's very precise, megawatts at this stage, but they're seeking approval for up to 1,300 megawatts, which they don't have the ability to, I guess, implement that until such time as they potentially get other access rights. They do have the 832.1 subject to planning approval. So that would mean that any VPA that you receive in terms of funding will be proportional to the number of megawatts actually constructed and implemented, I guess, Council's across that.

MS HUGHES: Yeah, we, we have had discussions around the difference between the access and what that means to the EnergyCo funding the Community Employment and Benefits Fund. And then there's also the actual project number in terms of how we negotiate the VPA.

MR PEARSON: Yeah. OK, good. So was there anything else, Council, that you want to flesh out on the things that Marie's run through there, or are you open to questions from Commissioners on some of the things that have been put on the table?

MR DALZELL: Yeah, open to the questions, and yeah, that would be the best way to go forward from here.

MR PEARSON: Yeah, and Jack, did you want to make some – yep.

5 **MR BOND:** Yeah, I always don't want to miss this opportunity just on that
Community and Employment Fund, and my team's heard me say this enough, is
that that can only be spent within the REZ. And if you look at the South West
REZ, there are absolutely no communities within the REZ. There's Hay and
there's maybe two other communities. The whole population of the REZ is, it's
10 less than 5,000 people. So how the money is actually going to be spent when
there's so many other communities, like Deniliquin, Conargo, Jerilderie that are
kilometres outside the REZ that are going to have the biggest impact, but we can't
spend that money outside the REZ is a big problem for Council that we see.

15 Even the VPAs and the impact of all the REZ coming to our rural communities as
well. And EnergyCo have come to the party with some funding for some
resources. But the amount of time of Simone, Marie and Maddie that the REZ has
taken up on Council has been significant.

20 When you look at some of the other REZs, some of those Councils probably do a
VPA, a couple a year. I don't even think Council here have probably done one in
10 years, or any Council around us as well. So it's huge for us and a big impact on
Council.

25 **MR PEARSON:** Yeah. So Jack, are you saying that the VPA has to be spent
within the REZ or the access rights funding?

MR BOND: No, no, only the access rights, Richard. Yeah, and the VPA can be
spent in negotiation outside of the REZ.

30 **MR PEARSON:** OK. Thanks. OK. Well, thank you. Fellow Commissioners, do
you have some questions?

35 **MR MICHAEL WRIGHT:** Richard, thank you. Can I just ask a question,
Simone, about your comment around, I think it was health services, and the
Council's preference, understanding that with that construction workforce coming
online, should the project be approved, there would be considerable additional
demand for health services, and perhaps other sorts of services as well. You
suggested that that could be – could that be dealt with through the onsite provision
of those services, I think you were mentioning, or there'll always be impacts on
40 places like Deniliquin, and how might that be managed?

MS HUGHES: Absolutely. Marie actually didn't bring that up, but I had that in
my list as well that I thought I'd tick off on.

45 **MS SUTTON:** Happy for you to respond, Simone.

MS HUGHES: So yes, definitely any of the emergency services, when you're
looking at locations and accessibility, whether that be ambulance, police, any, fire,

so on, but then also access to our local health services such as doctors, nurses, GPs, emergency, when you look at the workforce that, at peak of construction that will come with these projects, that needs to be considered given the strain on our local services now. And I think we'd be talking across all the communities that will be impacted by these projects.

I'm not sure how we – distance is one thing. Like if you actually needed to call for an emergency and there was an ambulance, like we are, from this project site in particular, probably at least an hour by the time that it got on the road, maybe a bit quicker than that. But all these things do need to be taken into consideration. And then if there is something we needed to respond to as a community, we also have an emergency service that is either taken off the table for our local needs as well.

So I think part of that too, you could also look at what these projects can leave as a legacy. Because at the moment we're full to pussy's bow with this stuff. We're strained with the resources we have. So yeah. All considerations that can fit into that comment.

MR WRIGHT: Yeah. But you'd certainly be looking for the proponent to deliver at least some services on site, ideally, yep.

MS HUGHES: Yep.

MR WRIGHT: OK, thanks Simone. Thanks Simone.

MS SARAH DINNING: Thank you. Could I, I was just, I think there was reference to roads, transport and road upgrades. Somebody was going to make a comment on that, was that Mark?

MR DALZELL: Yeah. Thanks. Thanks Commissioner. Yeah, so happy to pick up with that. So we're at the moment sort of in that REZ area, the Project EnergyConnect is well within construction. So we're getting a bit of a feel for how these large scale projects impact on our road network. We're mindful what's in the EISs in terms of dilapidation reports. So understanding the condition of the road now, and then agreements to maintain the road at or better than that condition.

What we feel is being missed, and we really want the developers to address, is that these, especially the local roads, once we get off the state highway network or regional roads, these local roads have been constructed for supporting low volume sort of agricultural traffic. And we feel that damage to the roads is, is inevitable, just given with the higher weights, and also the more traffic and the amount of traffic movements, moving these turbines, moving these blades are going to have. So we feel in that space, it's not to the community's benefit around just having a dilapidation report, and a fix it as you go, because you end up doing major works.

And this is where we're at, at the moment, and the adjoining Councils, especially around stock grids. So because these are really low volume roads, they put in stock grids, just structures that allow traffic to pass over them, just a series of metal bars,

but they're been destroyed by the Project EnergyConnect, and they'll be destroyed on these roads for the Pottinger Park and other developments.

5 It would be much more logical and beneficial to the community than undertaking the inevitable repair during the project, that those structures be upgraded at the commencement. And then it's maintaining that structure throughout the life of the project, which is much easier to do with a new structure than or upgraded infrastructure than with the current, the current standard. And then that provides part of that legacy.

10 Because it seems the discussions we've had with these developers and others is that they do want to leave this legacy, and ultimately there'll be improvements to the road. We just want to get ahead of that. Because we're in a position now that we seem to have tasked the road authority, the developers are happy to sort of
15 engage and pay for the work that needs to be done, but somehow we've got the responsibility of maintaining and keeping these roads open during the construction period. I don't think that was ever the intent around the conditions, that it came as an extra amount of work and responsibility to Council to do that.

20 So we're happy to acknowledge that that may be just how we've set up the agreements, and we just need to be clearer and better with that. But in terms of the road network and this interface, this last mile, yeah, we really feel there's a space in there that we – that developers can work on upgrades that will help, and help
25 their project, and help the management of the road throughout the construction process with their.

MR PEARSON: Mark, have you, have you got a schedule of roads that you think require this, I guess, proactive treatment, and have you provided that to the
30 Department and/or the applicant?

MR DALZELL: So it's really off the roads they're proposing to use. We're happy with the general network, it stays where it is, and we work on them. But if the proponent, I think with this one, it's, it's [Walgham 00:24:41] Road. So we would then provide that information on Walgham Road so we've got these bits of
35 infrastructure, these grades, bends, wherever, and sort of set that as we'd like to say those parts of the road upgraded. Other developments are impacting other roads within it.

40 I understand there's still discussions, that the developers are having discussions with Transport for New South Wales about actual access on the state highway network, a bit of a discussion around which ports they're going to use. Specifically for the Pottinger Park one, they will be coming down some way along the Cobb Highway there, and sort of know that that road network that they'll be impacting, the parts of the road network that they'll be impacting.
45

MR PEARSON: Yes, well, I think they've told us it's Port of Adelaide where they're proposing to bring turbines from via Broken Hill, Wilcannia, Ivanhoe, yeah, Cobb Highway. But I think it's fair to say that remains some question over

that, but that appears to be what they're proposing. That is what they're proposing.

MR DALZELL: Yeah.

5 **MR PEARSON:** Have you looked at the proposed or recommended conditions of
consent from the Department, and whether within those conditions, there is scope
for in particular your road issues to be addressed? For example, they have to do a
transport management plan, which will – that's where some conditions around
these things will live. Yeah, obviously not now, but it would be useful for you to
10 review the conditions recommended, and make any comments that you have as to
whether you think – these issues that you do have with the project. So relating to
the VPA, relating to traffic impacts are potentially addressed through those
conditions, or can be addressed through those conditions, or if you think other
mechanisms are required.

15 Because you know, the issues you're raising are quite legitimate. We obviously
want to, we don't think they should come to town and wreck your local roads, and
have them in a poor state of repair for five years, and people are having to navigate
potholes. We already have issues with the roads generally. So I think we are
20 interested to understand what your ask is in relation to road upgrades. So perhaps
you can provide that to the Commission, would be useful.

MR DALZELL: Yeah, no, that would be good, because this is an evolving piece
for it, and again, we're very much – our learnings around the Project
25 EnergyConnect, because that sort of went through that standard process, and we're
seeing all the EISs and developments for the wind farms and for the VNI West, the
other Transgrid project that will come online in a few years, very much around
that traffic management plan, which is the right way to go, and we can work with
it.

30 Just our learning at the moment is that when it sort of comes down to the actual
construction time where we're right in the middle of it for Project EnergyConnect
is that, yeah, it just seems to be a very reactive process in terms of stuff that we
would hope, and interactions we've had and discussions we've had with
35 developers have been they do want to be proactive. They do want to work with the
community and that. So it seems though everyone wants to sort of head this more
proactive way. But yeah, being more specific around this, because it is something
that's evolving for us, we'll definitely take that opportunity and provide more
information.

40 **MR PEARSON:** Yeah. That would be useful, I think. Thank you. Simone, did
you have your hand up? Someone did. Yeah, it was Simone.

45 **MS HUGHES:** Oh, yeah, sorry. Yep. Just to add to that too, we have had
discussions around ensuring that there's some acknowledgement of wet weather,
and having a wet weather contingency by the time these big things get on the road
and take their time to get from port to REZ. If we do have wet weather, a lot of the
access roads internally into the properties, but also those access roads, possibly

part of, as you leave the Cobb Highway, just what's going to happen if it turns wet? Because it doesn't take much rain to make those roads probably inaccessible to those. I know that they'll be sort of trying to build them up to a certain thing, but we don't want – I'd just love to know how they're going to handle it if it came in really wet and we had an inch of rain. And whether those trucks park out on the Cobb Highway, where are they going to sit? Like it's a real consideration. There's lots of, yeah, I think if we keep going down the list, I've got a few other things around impacts with traffic and roads, but happy to talk when we're up to that bit.

MR PEARSON: Yeah, well, you can raise them now. I mean, I would encourage Council to make a further submission to the Planning Commission. I'm not, I can't remember what date they're open till Jane? It's after the public meeting. So you have plenty of time.

MS HUGHES: It's the 12th or the 13th.

MR PEARSON: So the key thing, key things that you think are still on the table from Council's perspective would be useful.

MS HUGHES: Can I just ask a question, if I may? When we put in a submission to the Parliamentary Inquiry into the REZ, does that sort of information, so we've done so many submissions along the way addressing these things, do they all come into play as well, when making the decision?

MR PEARSON: Well, the submission – yeah, look, the submission you made to the Department of Planning through the EIS process is certainly something we've got access to. Broader submissions to Parliamentary Inquiries, not so much. I mean, we can obviously access that, if you think it's relevant to the project.

We were talking before the meeting, our remit here is specifically to do with the Pottinger Wind Farm Project. And I know EnergyCo's been running some consultations just this week in the local area. So I don't want, when we come to town next week, people to be confused about what our role is, which is specific to the Pottinger Wind Farm Project as to whether it should be approved, and if so, under what terms and conditions.

Obviously, the broader rollout is relevant to the project, the cumulative impact considerations. But we don't have a role as to whether renewable energy should be government policy. We don't have a role as to whether the REZ has been appropriately defined and consulted on. That's not our role either. Our role is very specific to this project, and whether or not it should be approved.

So if you think there are things in your parliamentary submissions that are relevant, you can draw our attention to that, and we'll obviously have a look at it. But I think it would be useful for the submission you make to the Planning Commission to be very specific to this project, and things that you would like to see done differently or better from Council's perspective would be very useful for the Commission.

MS HUGHES: Yep, great.

5 **MR WRIGHT:** Richard, can I just ask Mark a question about that schedule of works? I think it was Walgham Road, perhaps there's some other roads that the proponent would impact on if planning approval was granted. Do you know, Mark, whether that will be exclusively related to impacts from this proponent, or would those roadways potentially be used by other proponents or Energy Co?

10 **MR DALZELL:** It's my understanding with now the approved, the four approved projects that Walgham Road, it's a no-through road, so it'll be for the Pottinger Park road. The other developments are using roads more to the east of our network.

15 **MR WRIGHT:** OK. So, you can actually really point to that as being impacted by Pottinger, alone, yeah.

20 **MR DALZELL:** Yeah, for this one, that's a bit easier for us. We do have it as a sort of a point we need to work through with the other projects. And we're hoping now that there is the clarity from EnergyCo on who does it, we can start working with everyone in this space as a group. Because it's not much use everyone saying they're going to upgrade the same road. It doesn't need to be upgraded three times, it can just be upgraded once. But that investment that we would take to the upgrade we can use on nearby road networks. Because invariably people find their
25 own way, maybe not the heavy traffic, but light traffic and things like that. So we're really hoping they're up for discussions and they've indicated they are.

MR WRIGHT: OK, thank you.

30 **MR PEARSON:** OK. I note there's one thing on our agenda that we haven't touched on at all, other than just very much in passing, which is biodiversity, but were there some other points? So we're very clear that road upgrades and the VPA and healthcare services are big issues for Council. How do you feel about the proposal for an accommodation camp that they've proposed? Do you support that
35 in terms of managing the impact on, I guess, what's scarce accommodation in the local area, and somewhat distant? Hay and Deni are both somewhat distant from the project site. So do you have any comments on their proposed accommodation camp?

40 **MS HUGHES:** The only comment I had really around that, and we've spoken to the proponent about this in previous meetings, is if we can, it would be great to ensure that there is some effort put into looking at repurposing buildings and accommodation, whether that be between proponents. We're asking a lot of them to collaborate on a lot of these issues, because we see that as being key to
45 minimise impacts. But I think that's one thing that should be considered.

MR PEARSON: You mean once they've completed their project, they should be able to hand over some of that infrastructure to another proponent?

MS HUGHES: Yeah. Yeah. Well, my wish list when I walk in is to say, can we look at building a camp that could actually be repurposed to a town or a village that doesn't look like shipping containers? So it's just maybe thinking a little bit outside the square in terms of what we can give these communities moving forward, given our situation with housing and so on.

MR PEARSON: OK. Interesting point, yeah. I think I have talked to –

MR WRIGHT: Just on that –

MR PEARSON: Sorry, you go.

MR BOND: Sorry, Rich, I was just going to add, and I think Michael briefly touched on it before, is that now that we know who the successful proponents are with four projects, is that key leave impact. We touched a bit with the roads before as well. But I think now that we know who's successful and that they are also close to each other, I think we hopefully will see them work more collaboratively going forward, and try and reduce some of those joint impacts. Yep. Filtered water's been another one, and I've always said, rather than trucking water from 100 kilometres away, whether it be Hay, Deniliquin, or Jerilderie, is that they could actually go and build a batch plant on site that's so much closer, and then pipe it to each site so that we're not having as well that impact on our roads.

MR PEARSON: Yeah, definitely. Definitely. So in terms of the four approved projects, I know the Yanco Delta Wind Farm, the Dinawan Energy Hub, the Pottinger Wind Farm and the Bullawah Wind Farm, that's your understanding. Is that essentially what EnergyCo's been consulting on this week, on that four approved projects and what the, I guess, benefits and challenges are for the local areas? Is that essentially what their consultation's been about? I don't know if you've attended any of the sessions this week.

MS HUGHES: The intention of those consultations was to have a drop-in community sort of pop-up centre where anyone could come and ask information. The proponents were invited to come along to that. They're also doing the roadshow for local businesses this week as well, where the proponents will be attending that.

MR PEARSON: OK, thanks for that background. It's useful. Yeah, just in terms of repurposing accommodation camp, I think they have mentioned that they may be able to get access to an EnergyCo camp that's – once that project's completed. So I think their plans for the accommodation camp are a work in progress. But I think the point about being able to reuse is a very, very valid one. So we'll take that, we'll bear that in mind.

Was there anything you – I'm just looking to our agenda that we circulated ahead of the meeting. I think we've touched on most of the issues on the agenda. In terms of waste, I'm interested there. Are you talking about the decommissioning

state in 30 years' time; what are they going to do with these turbines? Or are you talking about waste associated with construction of the project?

5 **MR DALZELL:** Yeah, we're more talking – well both, but we're more talking about waste in terms of the construction. With the camp and whether they have their own camp or utilise, as you're saying, Transgrid have one about 5 k's out of Boorooban, so they'll definitely be close enough to this project.

10 In terms of waste facilities that Council has, we have very small village landfill places that they just have absolutely no capacity. So they can do their sort of investigations and say, oh, Boorooban's got a landfill. No, no. Our main landfill at Deniliquin is a licence, EPA licensed. But there are capacity issues. We are working through development of future cells and things like that. So we're very much concerned at the volume of waste that is going to be developed through
15 construction. So really looking for some work to be put into the waste management plans.

20 We've found up to date it's just been, oh, they'll enter into an agreement with Council. So a very broad statement that that will be managed down the road, or there'll just be some way of doing it. They do need to enter with that. But I think at this part through the EIS, there just needs to be more work. We would be looking at being more comfortable taking in, say, waste from the camp, and it would be sort of general waste that would align with our red bin system.

25 We run a red bin, a three-bin system here in town. Red bin, general waste for disposal, yellow bin for recyclables, a green bin for garden and food organic waste. So we'd be looking at them running a similar system. And then those waste streams, getting a feel for what that red bin waste stream is, and being able to dispose of that. But the yellow and green, there are opportunities with contractors
30 for them to manage those waste streams, sending it to material recovery facilities and composting facilities and that. So the sort of part of the waste stream.

35 Anything around the packaging, so we feel, especially things are going to come in packaging for various parts of the turbines and that, that they will need to have worked out a way of sending that somewhere else, sending it back to the people that they've got it from, or however that's done. Because we won't have scope to take on that. What we see anyway is large volumes that they'll generate during construction.

40 **MR PEARSON:** OK, thank you. I think there is a condition, I think, Jane or Geoff, requiring them to prepare a waste management plan. There are usually, there's also a rehabilitation and decommissioning plan that they have to prepare, I know that's – and to be quite honest, the Commission has a stronger condition that we would impose rather than the Department's recommended condition on that.
45

But yeah, there's no way they can expect to just dump everything in your local village tips. So we would require them to think that through and work with Council, and also Hay Council a lot more closely on that. But it's good to get that

on the table as a key issue for Council, which we certainly have got.

In terms of biodiversity, does Council have any comments there? I know that there is a fair bit of clearing involved with this project. The Plains Wanderer habitat is certainly an issue that the state agency is being concerned with in regard to the project. And I think they have certainly attempted to minimise the impact on that, but there is still a residual impact. Does Council have any concerns, or are you sort of leaving that to the state, relevant state agencies to carry the flag on that one?

MS SUTTON: Yeah, we definitely have concerns that it is addressed properly. Particularly when they say there is going to be an impact, we realise that they have reduced the areas that they're going to operate in. But yeah, we have concerns that that really is properly addressed. Because it's been a big issue in the past, and it certainly is going to be an impact. And we want to make sure that's – I mean, we have faith that the state agencies will, but we want to make sure it can be well enforced.

MR PEARSON: Yeah. OK. Yeah, it certainly appears to have been thoroughly addressed, but it is an issue that we've got on our agenda to look at more closely as we go through the determination phase of this project.

And I think the other thing we had on our agenda, you probably don't have necessarily a firm view on at this stage, is the recommended conditions of consent. I don't know, Marie, if you or your team has had a chance to look at that yet, but we would be interested in any comments you have on that, and any suggestions you have for improvements of those conditions from Council's perspective.

MS SUTTON: Yeah. So we did respond to the Department and we have seen the draft conditions. They came through I think late last year, early this year, and we've responded. But there was a lot of things that they hadn't conditioned up yet, and they said 'to be developed' and they were biodiversity, heritage, air, noise, vibration, visual impacts. So we've not – and we gave our responses to the other issues, but we've not seen whether those, have they been firmed up, we haven't had access to that.

MR PEARSON: Oh, OK. Well, they are available now on the Department's website. So I think it would be good for you to have a look and see whether they've addressed concerns that you had, and whether you've got any residual concerns with what's recommended. Because should the Commission determine to give approval to the project, we will obviously have regard to the recommended conditions, but we'll have our own views on some of those things. But I think it would be worth knowing if there's things that your Council specifically – whether you're happy with what's proposed, or whether there's some suggested amendments that you'd like to see would be useful as part of any submission.

And the closing date for any submissions is 5:00 p.m. on the 12th of June, so it's still a couple of weeks away. But we'd welcome a submission from – it doesn't have to be 10 pages, just any key issues you would like the Commission to

consider in its determination relating to conditions, relating to roads, waste and some of the other things we've talked about.

MS DINNING: Excuse me, can I just pop in one quick question?

MR PEARSON: Yep, Sarah.

MS DINNING: Thank you. And it's probably going back to a comment, Jack, you made about concrete onsite batching. So were you saying that was – and was that for this project particularly or generally? And also, is that a preferred approach for you?

MR BOND: Yeah, so concrete as well as I think portable water are two sources that could be building one source. Tomorrow, is it, we've got the REZ business day, where we've got big contractors and suppliers coming together with EnergyCo to talk about the plan forward. I did notice that the biggest concrete supplier, Mawsons, will be attending that meeting as well. So I'll be looking forward to sort of talk to them and see what their plans are, and hope that they can create a batching plan that's going to be sent to all these sites.

MS DINNING: OK, thank you. Because I note that in the submission, the parliamentary, you were, Hay Shire Council – no sorry, the other – water is a concern. Your Council, people are concerned about access to the local water supply. So if you've got any comments around that now or later, that would be good to comment on.

MR BOND: Yeah, the general conversation around that is that if one project is going, we'll handle one project. If all projects are going, we won't be able to handle four projects. So that's not something we can determine. That's something that they need to determine and work together planning forward. Otherwise, quite literally, the service will not be there for them.

MS DINNING: Yeah, yeah. Sorry, mate, it was River Shire Council, sorry. Thank you.

MR WRIGHT: Richard, can I ask a question more generally about – I mean, it's obviously this project and other projects occurring across the South West REZ, significant change to the economic structure of the LGA. And we've heard some commentary about impacts on services, but I'm just interested to know whether Council has a view more generally about whether this is going to be net beneficial for the LGA moving forward, future employment opportunities. It would appear as though these activities can, in some circumstances, coexist with existing agricultural activity. But just interested to know whether Council has a sort of more general view about Pottinger in particular, about the transformation that renewable energy investment is bringing to the South West and Edward River Council LGA in particular.

MR BOND: My thoughts on that is that the opportunities definitely outweigh the

impacts that we'll see, 100%.

MS HUGHES: I think there's lots more – there's a lot of synergies between agriculture and renewable energy as well that we sort of probably as a community and as both industries, haven't quite seen that yet. There's a lot of – yeah, there's a lot more to unfold, and I think once technology and industry catch up with each other, we could see some great things as well.

But I think in terms of agriculture, and you're touching on that, one of the key things that we do need to consider is any interruption to neighbouring businesses. It's not just agriculture, it's logistics, the amount of – the volume of goods and freight that's moved along, particularly the Cobb Highway, for us. There's going to have to be – I've been looking through the recommendations, and just that consultation around movements, but also having alternatives. If you've got a truckload of cows, they can't sit on the side of the road for two hours waiting for access to get through, or travel at 40 k's and be on the road for an extra couple of hours. That's a bit simplified, but we've got animal husbandry, we've got an industry that chases weather, tries not to move things during weather, or they have certain slots to deliver things.

I just think we can – it can all work, but the communication has to be key, back to our communities, out of respect. And I don't know whether that's – where that's been sort of included in not just the proponent, but with them working with Transport NSW as well. So that's something that I'd definitely put in our submission.

MR PEARSON: Yeah, that's a good point. The coordination with existing uses is very important on the highway. I know that they are proposing – I don't know what they call them, I can't remember, was it passing bays or where they can basically get off the road? But they'll be limited, obviously. And it is important that local businesses and activities are able to continue largely unimpeded by this big transport task. And they're talking three to four of those OSOM, as they call them, movements per day, I recall, Jane, I think that's the figure I wrote down somewhere? So –

MS HUGHES: I do have that fun fact somewhere in my book.

MR DALZELL: Yeah. I think the big thing for us is it's every day. It's getting that scope. I think some discussions might have been with the EnergyCo a few weeks ago, a month ago was, yeah, we understand the movement and sort of all the control and that for this OSOM movement. But there is four to six every day for two to three years for the projects.

And that's where we're seeing, the pace they go, it's not if you'll be impacted, it's, you will be impacted. Other road users are going to be impacted. And, yeah, really understanding that a bit more is, I think, something we need to do and provide more thoughts on that.

5 **MR PEARSON:** Yeah, definitely. So just – I’m not sure if the – I think these comments are available to everyone on the chat line here. The conditions are published on the IPC’s website, so you can access them from our website. I’m also not sure, is anyone from Council proposing to speak, I think it is next Wednesday in Deniliquin at our public meeting, or to attend the public meeting? Technically, it’s closed, but I think we would still be – we don’t have a lot of speakers in Deniliquin, so I think we would be quite open if someone from Council wanted to come and have a say on the day. Councillors or officers. So, yeah, I just –

10 **MR BOND:** Yeah, I think, Richard, I’ll be representing Edward River Council for that one, just in a five-minute time slot.

MR PEARSON: OK, perfect, yeah. Have you registered already, Jack, or –

15 **MR BOND:** I believe someone has registered for me, yes.

MR PEARSON: OK, good, good, good. OK. Well, look, I think we’ve covered everything we wanted to cover. Was there anything else that Commissioners or Council would like to raise before we sign off?

20 **MS DINNING:** No, thank you, Richard.

MR WRIGHT: No, thanks.

25 **MR PEARSON:** OK, well, that was a very useful meeting, and I do thank you for the issues you’ve put on the table. Submissions – interested to get a submission from you, and we’ll meet you on the day next week. And any comments on the conditions would also be useful.

30 So, thank you to everyone, and we’ll see you when we’re in Deniliquin, or at least some of you.

[Goodbyes]

35 **>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**