



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: BURROWAY SOLAR FARM (SSD-55968733)

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL:	ANDREW MILLS (CHAIR) SARAH DINNING
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	GEOFF KWOK TAHLIA HUTCHINSON
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:	PATRICK DALE ADAM SMITH ELOHANNA AZEVEDO
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE:	9:30AM – 10:30AM FRIDAY, 30 th JANUARY 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MR ANDREW MILLS:** Well, good morning, everyone and welcome. Before I begin, I'd like to just have an opening statement on the record. Firstly, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we virtually meet today and pay my respect to their elders, past and present.

10 So welcome to the meeting this morning to discuss the Burroway Solar Farm, currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant Edify Energy Pty Ltd proposes to develop a 100 megawatt state significant development solar farm and associated 100 megawatt 400 megawatt hour battery energy storage system, approximately 18 kilometres north of Narromine in the Narromine Shire local government area. The site falls within the Central-West Orana Renewable
15 Energy Zone.

My name is Andrew Mills. I'm the chair of the Commission and of this Commission panel and I'm joined by my fellow commissioner, Sarah Dinning.

20 **MS SARAH DINNING:** Good morning.

25 **MR MILLS:** We're also joined by Tahlia Hutchinson and Geoff Kwok from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure a 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.

30 This 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's important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice, but following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice and/or considers requires a formal response. Any
35 subsequent response of information or information that's provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

40 I request that all participants here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. Thank you for that and we'll begin.

45 Perhaps, I know you've sent through a presentation, so thank you for that as well. We have had a look at that already. We'd perhaps just like to formally introduce yourselves.

MR ADAM SMITH: No problem, thank you. Can everyone hear me okay?

MR MILLS: Perfectly, thank you.

MR SMITH: Thank you, I had to reinstall Zoom. Adam Smith here, Senior Project Manager for Edify Energy, coming to you from Dharawal land down in Sutherland Shire, so pay my respects to the elders past, present and future of the Sutherland area and I've got my colleagues Pat and Elo on the phone. Pat, do you want to jump on?

MR PATRICK DALE: Yes. Good morning, everyone. I'm calling from Edify's office in Brisbane. It's great to be with you all. I'm here on Meanjin country. A bit of background, I'm also a senior development manager for Edify. I've been at the company for five years now, in renewable energy development for 10 years and in the energy sector for 15. I was involved in signing up the original landowners in the early stage of the development process and I've been assisting Adam preparing the EIS along with our colleague Elo. I'll let her introduce herself. Thanks.

MS ELOHANNA AZEVEDO: Hi, good morning everyone. Can you hear me well?

MR MILLS: Yes.

MS AZEVEDO: Awesome. I'm calling from the Northern Beaches of New South Wales. Pay respects to the elder people and the people of the country. I'm a project development manager, supporting Adam and Patrick in the project and I've been at Edify for almost a year.

MR MILLS: Thank you. Perhaps I should just hand it over to you to go through your presentation and if you don't mind, can we just jump in and ask questions as we go?

MR SMITH: Yes, no problem.

MR MILLS: Lovely, thanks.

MR SMITH: I will screen share.

MR MILLS: I should add, you'll appreciate that the Commissioners and obviously the staff have all been through all of the relevant documents, the assessment report, the conditions and submissions and other things that have been made available to us. So we are across the project and it will be levels of detail I guess that we will be asking about and some of the proposed modifications that you've suggested in your presentation that we'll be delving into.

MR SMITH: Okay, no problem. I'll kick off the presentation and my colleagues Pat and Elo will just jump in where they see fit and any members of the panel or IPC, please jump in with questions as well, otherwise I have the tendency to speak quick and I'll end this presentation very quickly. So thank you for joining us. We're here to discuss the Burroway Solar Farm. Just a very quick background on Edify. Currently we do the whole lifecycle of the projects from front end

development, where we all sit, through to project structuring, construction management and we then own and operate our own assets. To date we've had six solar farms in operation and six large-scale batteries. Once the Burroway Solar Farm gets constructed it will be our 12th or 13th project going into construction and this is the first project we've had go through the IPC.

MR MILLS: Adam, just in terms of Edify itself, do I understand that there's been a recent change in ownership?

MR SMITH: Yes, so as of the first week of December last year, our original sole company director John Cole sold the project and sold the company and we are now owned by La Caisse, formerly CDPQ, they're a Canadian pension fund.

MR MILLS: Right. Thank you.

MR SMITH: Yes. So probably worth noting, if I mentioned – as I mentioned before, we had six solar farms in operations and four large-scale batteries. Due to that sale, we no longer own those but we did develop and own them historically but they're no longer our assets anymore.

So the Burroway Solar Farm, it's located at 1955 Eumungerie Road, Burroway. As you mentioned, 17 ks north of Narromine. 495 hectares of land and we are proposing a 100 megawatt solar farm with integrated 100 megawatt 400 megawatt hour battery and we're connecting to the Essential Energy 132 transmission line that traverses the site. I'm hoping this little video plays for you but this will just give you a overview of what the site looks like. This is taken from the site entrance. As you can see, very sparse, very flat piece of land, amazing for a solar farm.

MR MILLS: And was previously used for or up to date has been used for cropping, I understand?

MR SMITH: Yes, previously and currently still used for cropping by the landowner.

MR MILLS: What kind of crop? Do you know?

MR SMITH: Go Patty.

MR DALE: Basically a mix of broadacre cropping, I think the most recent harvest has been canola and wheat and in terms of ground visibility, what we'll see there in the coming weeks when we're at site will be bare earth essentially. It was harvested late last year.

MR MILLS: Yes. Thank you.

MR SMITH: Just a few brief pictures in case my video didn't work, just showing you the locations on the site where those images were taken and key project

components. So we'll have bifacial PV panels, power conversion and transformers, all the standard grid connection. We have two proposed access sites that you can see and energy storage and the most recent from our amendment report is to include an accommodation camp for up to 250 workers down in the southeast corner of the site as you come in off the site access point.

I'm sure you're all very aware of this, but our EIS did generate greater than 50 objections to the project, hence the reason we're here. Only 7% of those were within 100 kilometres of the project and none of them were within 5 kilometres of the project site. Key issues raised reflect what's in your agenda that you sent through, the visual impact, biodiversity impact, reliability of renewables, recycling of solar panels at end of life and the use of agricultural land. So pretty standard responses that we see across any renewable project to date.

Your agenda. So kicking off the agenda items, basically our comments on the Department of Planning's assessment report is we agree with the assessment report and we support their decision and conclusion that the project's approvable and in the public interest. Our only real comments relate to the conditions of consent and getting some clarification and refinement on a few proposed conditions, just to make sure that the project is more developable than it currently stands with those conditions.

So I'll jump straight on to the conditions. So condition A5 notes that unless the Planning Secretary agrees otherwise, a dispersed battery storage system must not exceed 20 megawatt hours of energy storage capacity collocated. We requested further information on the justification from this from the Department and they didn't supply us with any rationale as to why that condition has been opposed. As it's opposed, we think it severely limits the project and current battery technologies coming out such as the Tesla Megablock and the Fluence Smartstack sit at approximately 20 megawatt hours per unit. So having that condition would restrict us in using those technologies if we chose to, even if they did meet all the fire safety studies and other conditions that we have to meet. Sorry, Pat, can you jump in? I've just got to get some water.

MR DALE: Sure. I think the point here is that there needs to be a greater appreciation from the Department, and we've stated this on various occasions in other projects, about the rapid evolution in technology at both energy density, cost reduction improvements and the fast iterations of leading tier one OEM manufacturers releasing new enclosure designs that have various energy densities. And what we find is that often these overly restrictive conditions are not appreciating that this project may be built in say four, five years' time perhaps and this is doing nothing but almost guarantee the require for a modification which is a burden on the developer and the Department for ongoing assessments, where those assessments actually will be fully addressed from a fire safety perspective in condition B39 of preparing a fire safety study.

We fully support the preparation of that pre-construction when procurement is undertaken. That involves providing fire safety certificates from Underwriters

Laboratory and other third party agencies that set defined spacing limitations on battery units. We appreciate the risk of fire propagating from one unit to another and we appreciate that the Department is trying to step in and create some limitations on the clusters of battery units that can be set next to one another.

However, what I think you'd find is like a 20 megawatt limitation here from a distributed battery arrangement here defies the logic of where you're seeing 200 and 2,000 megawatt battery systems being installed in one single location. So we've asked the Department why in a distributed battery system they see the need to impose a 20 megawatt hour limitation when they are also signing off and approving 2,000 megawatt battery installations in one single clustered location. It defies logic. We've sought clarification and no clarification has been provided.

So we simply ask the Commission to consider that this may be a condition, A5, that is misaligned with what we believe the study results will have to prove in condition B39 and are simply suggesting to the Department and yourselves that having any nominal limitation, in this case 20 megawatt hours, does not align with a proven risk mitigated design approach of what we need to achieve in condition B39.

MR MILLS: One of the parts, if I recall correctly, one of the parts of this condition is it also limits it to two. Is that right? Is my reflection correct that it would actually only be two distributed batteries together?

MR DALE: That could be right. It could be two, it could be 20, it could be 200, we believe that the Department has not provided any technical justification as to why they would seek to impose these limitations, whatever they may be. And we know that we must be preparing a fire safety study along with supporting evidence to justify the proposed arrangement and layout and orientation of any battery system that mitigates the fire risk, has to be signed off by the fire agencies. And when we query the Department as to why they feel the need to come in and impose additional conditions that are not being reflected of any concerns that we're aware of from the fire agencies, we don't get a response back. So I think that these numbers are somewhat immaterial. It's the imposition of them without justification that leads us to raise this again with the Commission.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

MR SMITH: Thank you. So our next query was regarding condition B37 and the construction and operation of the temporary workers accommodation facility, as described in our EIS and the amendment report. So we do acknowledge that the surrounding area has a lack of accommodation. Dubbo Council and Narromine have all shared that with us. So we went down the path of providing the amendment report to show that we can, if required, construct a temporary workers accommodation to house our temporary workforce of 250 people, which is 250 people at peak over a three-month period. The condition came through that we have to build the whole 250 person camp prior to commencing all other construction works.

We think that's unreasonable as some of the minor enabling works at the start don't require accommodation on site and additionally condition B39 states that we have to do an accommodation and employment strategy prior to construction, so we would propose to the Commission that the outcomes of the accommodation and employment strategy form the requirement of what size and if we have to build a temporary workers accommodation camp. So we would like to employ as many local people as we can. Potentially there will be further accommodation options in Narromine and the surrounding regions when we go into construction.

So we would – yes, we would like to say that if the accommodation and employment strategy notes that we can do a reduced scale facility, have it in an alternate location or if no on site workers accommodation is appropriate and supported by Council and Department at the time, then we shouldn't have to be restricted to building that camp. Anything else on that, Patty?

MR DALE: I think the most salient point really is that the camp is currently, as drafted in this condition, a critical path item and I query the logic to that when the initial workforce would not be proportionate to installing and operating a camp with a full capacity of 250 headcount. That's a material cost impost, it's a schedule misalignment and right now it defies the logic of a construction program and so at the very least we are seeking to highlight that currently we feel that the camp may indeed be required, but certainly should not be a critical path item.

MR SMITH: And may not have to be 250 people, may be a smaller requirement.

MR MILLS: I know both Sarah and I have some questions on that but Sarah, do you want to go first?

MS DINNING: Yes, thank you. Am I – yes, microphone's on?

MR MILLS: Yes.

MR SMITH: Yes, yes.

MS DINNING: It's only taken five years, hasn't it? I suppose one of the questions is that you did do an amendment report which was based on the building of a temporary workers accommodation camp and that was – I'm not quite sure if all the timing and the scaling was in there but that provided detailed information of the benefits of it and was then reassessed by all the agencies and the Council. So would you like to talk about that, you know, that was obviously something you were – you've responded to feedback from key stakeholders and proposed that and invested quite a bit in the report.

MR SMITH: Yes, correct. So we initially didn't propose an accommodation camp. We proposed that it'd be assessed pre-construction as an outcome of the accommodation and employment strategy. Dubbo Council subsequently provided feedback that that's not acceptable and we need to provide an amendment report

on how we can accommodate our people now as of today if we were going to construction today. So we did do an amendment report to highlight the benefits of a camp if it was needed to be done. Excuse me. And we do agree, there are benefits. If there's no accommodation available when we go into construction, we can house them on site, there's a minimal increase in traffic associated with this. It does increase our construction program by three months.

We're lucky enough that we have a site that is large enough to accommodate a facility and not impact any of our solar farm development area, so we can accommodate it easily on our site without having any additional biodiversity impacts, visual impacts to neighbours. And Narromine Council also provided us guidance that they can support the water requirements for a temporary accommodation if needed and also that their sewerage facility can take away any waste from the accommodation camp, if required.

So we do agree it is a benefit for the project if it is required. Edify's position still, as Pat mentioned, is if it's not required, we shouldn't have to construct it or shouldn't have to construct it to the size of 250 people.

MR MILLS: So what process, I guess, would you be suggesting to make that determination? Because if the councils are insistent at a later point in time, do you propose that it be, I guess, that this condition be modified in terms of both the timing and the consent or the agreement of councils?

MR SMITH: Correct.

MR DALE: The most important feature here really is the timing that this is being imposed. So we're obviously in front of you today and may have not progressed to the IPC hearing without agreeing to consider an accommodation camp. So we have willingly done that and we're very pleased to have progressed to this point.

To your question on what other mechanisms would be used to determine whether a camp is necessary, condition B39, which we have no objections to, requires us to prepare an accommodation and employment strategy which would be shared with our host council, Narromine Council, which by the way has never raised camp as a concern in their eyes. The accommodation camp concerns have been raised by the adjacent council of Dubbo Regional Council.

And so it was at the eleventh hour that the adjacent council then placed this impost on us and made it clear to the Department of Planning that they would not be supporting this, nor should the Department support this in their referral to the Commission unless a camp is added as a feature of our application. So we've willingly added that and prepared the relevant material to see the camp be a part of this development application and likely a feature of the project going forward.

What's incredibly difficult, however, to determine is cumulative impacts, competing construction efforts, things that have nothing to do with the energy sector that may be taking up accommodation, be they seasonal tourism or inland

rail or major other projects that are very difficult to get any clear timeframes on from any of those parties in charge of that scope.

5 And so that was always the intent that we'd be preparing that strategy based on the, you know, the pre-construction lead up so that we can get a sense of what the art of the possible entails. I think that it is prudent that an accommodation camp be considered but it is a showstopper and defies logic of a construction program to have it as a first undertaking as part of the build. The commentary that basically it requires the camp to be operational before a shovel is swung on site and that is not
10 proportionate to the construction workforce at that time.

So that is the fundamental disagreement that we have on this condition B37 and we would like a condition B39 to be run out in its true course to determine the strategy and what is the appropriate headcount, timing and such, when we have a
15 clear understanding of construction commencing. So it's not a total disagreement that a camp should be featured but it very much is a total disagreement that it should be featured as one of the first construction items.

MR MILLS: In terms of social impacts, so there's been a focus I guess in the
20 management plan around a number of things and you've already referred to the treatment of wastewater and other things that have been addressed as well as health impacts and so on. We've heard in other renewable energy project plans, people talk about other social impacts, for example, if there is additional people coming in for the construction period and that construction period, I mean, well
25 you peak at 250 people, the construction period's not just the six months, is it? It's longer than that.

MR SMITH: Yes.

MR MILLS: And people come in over the period and bring families because it's
30 for a longer period, there can be an impact on other things such as childcare and so on, which may be limited in the area. Have you turned your mind to those kinds of social impacts as well and would that be part potentially of what you might have as your accommodation plan?

MR DALE: I mean, I'm sorry, if the suggestion is that families may be
35 housed within the temporary accommodation camp, I don't know if that's typical of industry.

MR MILLS: No.

MR DALE: But perhaps I've misunderstood the question.

MR MILLS: No, sorry, it wasn't that so much but it was more – obviously you'll
45 have temporary worker accommodation but if some of those workers are bringing families, they may not want to use the temporary worker accommodation but take up other accommodation in the area and there could be other social impacts arising from that.

MR SMITH: Yes, I feel that would come as – so our goal would be that we would undertake our accommodation and employment strategy with our EPC contractor when we engage them and so they'd be a part of it. So they would have more of a handle on where the employment's coming from, who those people are and what the requirements are, like you mentioned. Is it a few families coming as well, it's not just 250 straight workers coming in.

So the social impacts, we would hope, would fall out of the accommodation and employment strategy or at least guide us to further assess the social impacts of any incoming families. So we don't have that data just yet because we don't know where our workforce is coming from. We could have 50 to 100 local workers and only 100 people required to come in from out of area, so we're not sure of that makeup yet until we get our EPC contractor on board and start getting tenders out and ready for the for the build of the project.

MR MILLS: You can appreciate why Dubbo Council in particular that has – probably at the centre of the Central-West Orana Renewable Energy Zone and seeing many projects being proposed in its area would be concerned about the cumulative impact of all of those projects being undertaken together potentially but obviously on a consistent [unintelligible 00:29:03] rolling basis and so on.

MR SMITH: Yes. Yes, and we're definitely not disagreeing that an accommodation camp may be required, we just think further assessment into the size and timing needs to be undertaken post approval pre-construction to ascertain what the correct camp is. Yes, so we definitely don't disagree that it may be required.

MR MILLS: Okay, thank you.

MR SMITH: No problem.

MR MILLS: Sarah, did you have any other questions?

MS DINNING: Just if I may, just one more and I think as the discussions happened, this question may be resolved but it's about the wastewater management. In the documentation, it talks about onsite the utility to treat wastewater and in other – you've just mentioned about it perhaps being carted and the local government or the local water utility will be able to manage it. Which local water utility, is that Narromine or Dubbo? Because we understand from a letter from the Department of Water that the local water sewerage – water utility, sewerage treatment facilities would require an upgrade to facilitate this, being, I imagine, your maximum 250, when you're at that period of maximum. So perhaps you could just clarify your thinking at this point in time around the wastewater management, please?

MR SMITH: No problem. So our discussions with Narromine Council and their director of planning there, we had discussions prior to submitting this amendment

report, identified the water required for it. They said that was okay, we can get all the potable water from one of their standpipes and subsequently they noted that we have roughly the equivalent wastewater coming back out again and that their facilities can accommodate the amount of wastewater that we will be producing.

We put in the amendment report that we may have onsite facilities to treat this waste. That was just there to acknowledge that this can be done and the accommodation provider that provided us with the design and layout notes that they have done it on previous projects. So we just didn't want to discount that option if it became viable once we go into construction. But if onsite treatment doesn't work, Narromine Council have noted that they can take our wastewater.

MS DINNING: Thank you. Thank you, Andrew.

MR MILLS: Thank you. Let's keep moving then.

MR SMITH: No problem. Unless we want to, I won't delve into this. I think we've covered it enough on the accommodation and employment strategy and we believe there should just be a further link between the accommodation and employment strategy and the size and timing of the temporary workforce accommodation. Are we okay if I move forward? Pat?

MR MILLS: Yes, I think that's [unintelligible 00:32:19] interest.

MR DALE: Yes and but the last thing I'd say on it is we have to assume worst-case scenario in every element of the planning application and so we've effectively assumed that 100% of the workforce would be in the camp as well, which I think is unlikely, to be generous. Yet we want to avoid again the burdensome modification process if we said 220, for example, and 221 beds were required. You can see why we have to take these conservative approaches, which then can potentially create follow-on upgrade requirements there that that may be required that you've noted, but of course it's hopefully taken within the degree of conservatism.

MR MILLS: Patrick, how long does it take to build a TWA?

MR DALE: Well, I guess it depends on the capacity and the scale, right, but typically they're modular. There's a lot of efforts done offsite and can be dropped in and then a lot of them the utilities will either be standing waiting or quickly connected up. So I think in the order of, you know, three to six months is a generous timeframe where that could be achieved. But basically, on that point, whatever the time frame is, the way that the condition is structured, it really is that we would not be able to commence any other works onsite. So if you think about the sequencing from financial close –

MR MILLS: No, I understand that point. I was just curious in terms of the actual construction period if you're talking – that if you're talking your critical path is more aligned to prepare the accommodation and employment strategy, engage

with councils, then potentially construct and before you actually then go in to actually building the solar farm itself, then I just want to get a sense of what that timeline of critical path is.

5 **MR DALE:** Sure thing. And for what it's worth, you know, I've lived in a camp for two years as well and I don't think any regulator should be in a rush to force workers to go into those facilities unless it's absolutely necessary. You know, it places a lot of isolation burdens on the construction crew and also it concentrates the spoils, where otherwise when accommodation solutions are dispersed
10 throughout a community, all boats rise but with the same tide. And that can flow down to the IGA, to the laundromat, to the cafés and restaurateurs and we like to see the spoils be shared as widely as possible and to make sure that we have an appropriate accommodation strategy set up for whatever that local community requires.

15 But I do query the folks that come up with these conditions if they've ever spent a night in a camp and why they seem so hell bent on enforcing them to be a feature of many of these construction bills. Notwithstanding the fact that there are many corners of Australia where a housing crisis is biting down hard, I think that's a
20 nationwide problem, it's not necessarily solely a Narromine Dubbo feature. But I do think that a level of balance there needs to be struck. So, sorry.

MR SMITH: No problem. All right, that's the end of the conditions we wanted to discuss and raise with the IPC, so I'll just move on to the key issues as identified
25 from your agenda. So the traffic impacts, basically our peak traffic is 48 movements a day, 25 in a typical construction period and if we were to develop the accommodation camp at the start, it adds 18 peak trips over a three month period. And the construction camp provider that I went to to get the design said they could build this camp in a hurry, it'd take them three months to get it done.
30 So we put a three month extension on our construction timeframe.

Through the EIS and the response to submissions report, at the request of Transport for New South Wales, we did remove the Port Botany route from the project. So we're now proposing solely for everything to come from the Port of
35 Newcastle. And access to the project is proposed off two right-hand turn treatments off Eumungerie Road. So there will be one where you'll see the site where the previous video came from and then one just north of that just to add two.

40 **MR DALE:** And those are two options, right. Only one will ever be built. But the rationale for that is Essential Energy, who own the line and will create the restrictions operating under the easement, what we sought is to have one access option that would be north of the easement, where heavy vehicles would not need to traverse into the site under the transmission line and have more of an
45 unimpeded access to the balance of land. And then another one at the far bottom left-hand corner, the red dot, that is representative of where the existing farm access gateway is that obviously doesn't need to consider some of the height considerations that we would in terms of the clearance distance with the

transmission line. So we've put forward two. Only one will be built. I hope that's clear to everyone.

5 **MR MILLS:** In either event, whichever route was taken and getting to Eumungerie Road, I guess I was thinking more in terms of the local movement, I've had a closer look since putting this on the agenda. It looks like it doesn't matter which of the alternatives – and this is again been looking at the council concerns, you still need to go through the back of Dubbo, effectively, to get around, is that correct?

10 **MR SMITH:** Yes, we do. That's correct. Yes.

15 **MR DALE:** Yes, that's correct and I suppose that's no different for the Nyngan Solar Farm that was built by AGL a decade ago, no different to the Nevertire Solar Farm that was built five years ago by one of our other industry participants.

MR MILLS: And we will look at the route that we go on the site inspection but that is – the proposed route is currently adequate, is that correct?

20 **MR SMITH:** Yes. Yes, it's currently adequate and doesn't require any upgrades. The only upgrades are our two site access points.

25 **MR MILLS:** Yes, okay. And I did note that you'll be required to prepare assessments both before and after your truck movements.

MR SMITH: Yes, and we're completely in agree that dilapidation surveys before and after, yes.

30 **MR MILLS:** Sarah, do you have any questions on this point?

MS DINNING: Thank you, not on transport. Thank you.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

35 **MR SMITH:** Okay, no problem.

MR MILLS: I think we have spoken about this actually in terms of –

40 **MR SMITH:** Cumulative.

MR MILLS: – cumulative impacts for the most part, yes.

MR SMITH: Okay, I'll move on.

45 **MS DINNING:** Could I – sorry and we had – Andrew, my apologies. I just found something I hadn't realised before. You had responded to impacts on local health services during construction and you were going to develop a construction health and wellbeing framework.

MR SMITH: Yes, correct.

5 **MS DINNING:** [unintelligible 00:39:50] really good. So I would think – if that is – it’s not obviously in the conditions but if you don’t have an accommodation camp, you’ve still got a site office, I imagine, with the appropriate medical facilities.

10 **MR SMITH:** Yes, we will.

MS DINNING: Because that’s one of the impacts on the local, you know, local health district [unintelligible 00:40:09].

15 **MR SMITH:** Yes, there will be still the – sorry, yes, yes, agree. Yes, there still will be the appropriate facilities on site and as noted, it may be telehealth or a nurse come out once or twice a week, but that’ll be determined, as appropriate. Yes.

20 **MS DINNING:** Thank you. Thanks, Andrew.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

25 **MR SMITH:** Accommodation and workforce, I believe we’ve covered this pretty well but just a few extra things to add. The fire water supply, we are adding – so the site as proposed has five 45,000 litre tanks dedicated to firefighting. We have added an additional one at 25,000 litres, which is just for the accommodation camp. And there’ll be no lighting impacts external to the accommodation camp as per any standard solar farm in operation.

30 **MR MILLS:** In terms of that, there’s a – it’s about 40, 45,000 difference between the additional tank for – no, it’s not just potable water but water required by the accommodation camp and so – yes, here it is, the additional 20,000 litre water supply tank for – that’s for firefighting and then an additional 62,000 to 62 and a half thousand of potable water required per day during peak construction.

35 **MR SMITH:** Yes.

40 **MR MILLS:** And Narromine – I think I heard you say earlier Narromine are comfortable with providing that water, is that right? That difference, that additional?

45 **MR SMITH:** Yes, they’re comfortable with providing that water. We worked it out to be approximately five water carts per day and they said that they’re comfortable with that with the caveat that obviously if the area does go into a severe drought, we’d have to find stuff elsewhere, which we completely understand. And we do still have to go through the water licence requirements with Narromine Shire Council to do all that and get that approved and appropriate. But they have initially said yes, we can source all that water from them.

MR MILLS: Okay, thank you.

5 **MR SMITH:** No prob. Social impacts, we have touched on a few of these but we
continue to liaise with Narromine and Dubbo, the LALC, community
stakeholders, we've been attending community meetings through Department of
Regional Industry and Growth to get our name out there. We've started doing
collaborating with Skillset, the Narromine LALC and Ngubambiny Aboriginal
10 Corporation to start providing training programs to the local people in the
surrounding area and we've been met with a lot of positivity from everyone we
meet, especially the LALC. They're really, really for the project. Anything in
particular you'd like me to touch on for social impacts?

15 **MS DINNING:** Just a question with the ongoing engagement with their councils
because have you discussed with them the proposal to not start a temporary
accommodation until after an employment and accommodation strategy is done?
Has that discussion been had?

20 **MR SMITH:** To be honest, I have called Dubbo numerous times, knocked on the
door when I was up there for the Department's regional industry event and sent
them emails and I've had no response. I have discussed it with Narromine Council
and they believe that that is a more proactive approach moving forward, that the
accommodation and employment strategy forms the outcome of the camp.
25 Narromine Council have also noted that they are in the initial stages of looking at
building an accommodation camp on council land because they note, you know,
there's inland rail coming through next to our site, there's the Burroway Wind
Farm adjacent to our site and a few other projects.

30 So they're looking at developing a camp themselves and said, you know, "If
feasible, would Edify support and use our camp?" and we think initially yes, we
would, because that's a much better outcome than us building a temporary camp
and then getting rid of it at the end, that if we can help Narromine Council deliver
a permanent camp, that would be something that we would look into and would
form part of our accommodation and employment strategy.

35 **MS DINNING:** Thank you, Adam.

40 **MR SMITH:** No prob. Visual impacts. To be honest, I don't think I've worked on
a project that has so minimal visual receivers. The closest receiver to this project is
1.8 kilometres away. There's only 10 within 4 kilometres. All those near
neighbours are supportive of the project and didn't submit any objection to the
project and there's four public viewpoints, which are basically all along
Eumungerie Road. So in terms of visual impact, I don't think you can get a better
site than this. Patty, do you want to add anything?

45 **MR DALE:** No, I echo that. It's very rare that there's 18 football fields between
your fenceline and the nearest house. I think that's a great strength of this site. We
never expected to be in front of the panel. After receiving more than 50

submissions of opposition, we thought that whilst this might not have the best prospects from a grid perspective, the planning and land and siting of the community is excellent. Yet unfortunately we still find ourselves here, going through this protracted process. But I'm pleased to say that I have met with all of these nearby neighbours and at the very worst they were very – had a neutral stance towards the project and many are very keen to see this get up.

MR SMITH: Any comments from the Commission?

MR MILLS: It's very open and so the – you've done mock-ups, haven't you? I just don't have them in front of me at the moment but –

MR SMITH: There is photo montages from the public viewpoints, yes.

MR MILLS: Yes, so we'll go back and remind ourselves of those. Yes, thank you.

MR SMITH: No problem. We did discuss water supply, so I can cover this again but basically our New South Wales RFS said that we required five 45,000 litre tanks, so that's what we provided. Narromine supports our potable water and rural water requirements. So if there's – anyone got any additional comments on any of those? No. Okay.

MR MILLS: No. Thank you.

MR SMITH: Hazards. Pretty standard again. We're lucky we've got such a large site that we can have sufficient asset protection zones, defensible space, all that type of stuff. We have sufficient area on site to provide all the fire water tanks, the required road widths of 4 metres that RFS require for their trucks. And in terms of contamination, there's no legacy contamination on this site and we'll document any spill response procedures in our management plans as we move forward. And obviously any battery systems will have our fire safety study conducted pre-construction and approved by Department of Planning to prevent any potential contamination issues there. So any questions?

MR MILLS: No. I see that you've got recycling for when you take things down and I – is it the case that you would expect that over time the panels might be replaced by more efficient future technology improvements and so on?

MR SMITH: Look, potentially some just get damaged through the operational life of the project. We have got letters of support from numerous solar panel recycling companies in New South Wales and for our projects in Queensland that can recycle panels to 97 to 99% recycle their materials. A few potentially will get damaged during construction and transport, so they'll be recycled. But overall, they'll generally last the life of the project. Would that be a correct comment, Patty?

MR DALE: And I suppose the business case does contemplate a repowering of the site, which I think you alluded to. So, you know, the substation is typically designed for a life of 50 years. That's gifted to the network owner for a dollar and so I think that there is a natural tendency for the asset owners to seek to align the generator to the sunk cost of the connection asset and so I suppose in give or take year 25 to 30, once the warranties have concluded for the modules around year 25. there is this contemplation of a repowering. And we're very supportive of the New South Wales – and have been meeting with the New South Wales EPA and leaders in UNSW that are I think at the forefront of the recycling of solar panels and we very much support the banning of the e-waste to landfill and see this circular economy being a great opportunity in the subsequent decade to come.

MR MILLS: Thanks, Pat.

MR SMITH: Any more comments on that slide at all?

MR MILLS: No. Thank you.

MR SMITH: I think we just covered off all that waste, we've done a conceptual waste management plan. we'll update that to a waste management plan pre-construction. We've got our accommodation waste generation there, that was provided to us from the accommodation camp provider. So those numbers we feel are very accurate on what will go in and out of the accommodation camp. And again, Narromine Council support our – any waste with the exception of any hazardous waste. If it comes on site, will go off in accordance with EPA requirements. Any comments at all, questions?

MR DALE: [unintelligible 00:51:21] sorry.

MR MILLS: Sorry, go on, Pat.

MR DALE: I just think that with this being the last slide, I think one of the main features that we haven't discussed really today is noted in the Department's recommendation report about the responders of these opposing submissions. Hopefully it is quite clear that none of them have lived within 5 kilometres of the site and I think 76 out of 81, I might be off on one or two of those numbers, but it's roughly 76 of the 81 submissions came from over 100 kilometres away.

When I look at the Major Projects Portal today, I see 10 solar proposals that are sitting there with submissions of more than 50 and that need to be assessed by the IPC. That's 10 from 10 that have gone through the Department's assessment process and have either got 51 or sometimes many hundreds of submissions of opposition and I think I'd be remiss to say that yesterday when we spoke with the directors of our new shareholding entity from Canada, we're adamant – I and Elo basically advised them that every New South Wales application today should expect to go to the IPC because the power of the internet, community forums and the like and automated responses that these new large language models can generate, it's incredibly easy to hit 51 submissions. Sometimes they don't even

refer to the Burroway Solar Farm. They're a copy and paste from some other solar farm and despite that coming from Far North Queensland or Tasmania, they must be considered a proper submission by the Department. So I also think that there's an interesting data centre application that has also gone through a similar –

MR SMITH: I think we've lost you, Pat.

MR MILLS: Yes, you're breaking up. I know the point that you're making, Pat, and we're conscious of it and government is conscious of it as well.

MR DALE: There's very strong site there from community standpoint.

MR MILLS: Yes, ultimately that will be a – it's a policy decision for government as to what they do about the matter that you're raising.

MR DALE: But we appreciate the extra level of scrutiny that that you have provided on this and in support of the Department, who I sympathise with. They're between a rock and a hard place.

MR SMITH: Yes. I guess the last thing to note and you would be aware of it but we did also receive our EPBC approval during our response to submissions phase, so we've got that, we're not a controlled action as well, so the federal government's very supportive of the project too. And that is the end of our slide. I'll stop sharing.

MR MILLS: It's a question – we've already dealt with the conditions that you're concerned about. Sarah, do you have any other questions or –

MS DINNING: Not related directly to this, however, if I may, you've referred to the new owners and obviously you, Edify team, have got a lot of experience in this area and renewable energy, so will you be still involved in this, you know, this solar farm?

MR SMITH: 100%. Our new owners, Le Caisse, are not changing the structure or people. We're actually growing in headcount and we're still operating on the same model as before. So develop the project and then own and operate it. So Edify as an entity will, once constructed, own and operate this Burroway Solar Farm.

MS DINNING: Great. Thank you very much. Thank you, Chair. Thank you and thank you for your time today and for the detail and bearing with us through the questions and our getting a greater understanding of the project. We appreciate it.

MR SMITH: Not a problem at all. We'll probably see you in a few months for our Brewongle Solar Farm as well, that's coming to you as well.

MR MILLS: All right.

MS DINNING: Thank you.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

5 **MR SMITH:** No worries.

MR DALE: All the best for the weekend, thank you for your time.

10 **MR SMITH:** Thank you very much.

MS AZEVEDO: Thank you, everyone.

MR MILLS: Thank you all.

15 **>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**