



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: SUNDOWN SOLAR FARM (SSD-8911)

APPLICANT MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: SARAH DINNING (Chair)
MICHAEL WRIGHT

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON
GEOFF KWOK

APPLICANT
REPRESENTATIVES: JOSH CURRAH (Senior Project Development
Manager)
ANGUS KING (Senior Manager Environmental
Planning and Development)
CHELSEA MILLES (Associate Director,
Origination and Development)
ANIL SINGH (General Manager, Australia)
DAVID KRSEVAN (General Manager, APAC)

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 1:00PM – 2:00PM
MONDAY, 29th JUNE 2026

THE MEETING COMMENCED

MS SARAH DINNING: Good afternoon and welcome, thank you very much for being available for this meeting this afternoon.

5

Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

10

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the state significant development application for the Sundown Solar Farm (SSD-8911) currently before the Commission for determination. The Applicant, Sundown SF Subco Pty Ltd, a subsidiary of Recurrent Energy (Australia) Pty Ltd, proposes to develop a 360-megawatt solar farm and an associated 150-megawatt/600-megawatt-hour battery energy storage system in the

15

The project site is located approximately 30 kilometres east of Inverell and 38 kilometres west of Glen Innes within the New England Renewable Energy Zone. My name is Sarah Dinning and I am the Chair of this Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioner, Michael Wright. We are also joined by Jane Anderson and Geoff Kwok from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

20

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the 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. 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.

25

It's important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues wherever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice. Following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers require a formal response. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

30

35

I request that all participants here today 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.

40

So, we'll now begin. And if you could introduce yourselves and I understand that you have an opening statement presentation. Thank you.

MR CURRAH: Yes, thank you. We can commence if we share the screen. One moment. While we're getting that going, I can make some introductions. You've got myself, Josh Currah, Development Manager here at Recurrent. You want me to do all of them? We've got David Krsevan to my left here, and Anil Singh. Chelsea Milles to my right, and Angus King as well.

45

MS DINNING: Could I just check please with my colleagues before we go. The reason for us getting everyone to introduce themselves is the recognition of the voice. So, would you mind all introducing yourselves because then when the transcript captures who says/said what.

MR CURRAH: Understood.

MR DAVID KRSEVAN: David Krsevan. I'm the General Manager for APAC.

MS DINNING: Thank you.

MR ANIL SINGH: Hi, everyone. Anil Singh, the General Manager, Australia, Recurrent Energy.

MS CHELSEA MILLES: Chelsea Milles, Associate Director of Development.

MR ANGUS KING: And Angus King, Senior Manager for Planning.

MS DINNING: Thank you.

MR CURRAH: We'll get our screen going. All right. Can everybody see that?

MR MICHAEL WRIGHT: Yes.

MS DINNING: Yes, we've got it in front of us as well. Thank you.

MR CURRAH: All very good. Okay. So, yes, thank you very much. Again, just reiterating, the Sundown Solar Farm Applicant Meeting. Similarly, I note an acknowledgement of country of the traditional owners on the lands on which we meet today, the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation. We do pay our respects to Elders past and present.

The agenda, we'll follow what's been circulated. We'll do a brief overview of Recurrent Energy as developer. We'll speak to some of the benefits of the proposed project, Sundown Solar Farm, some of its engagements, amendments to our application which followed those engagements during the Response to Submissions. We'll give any comments on the Department's Assessment Report. We'll cover key issues which the community has asked for us to address. We have a section for other items and comments on the Department's recommended conditions.

MR GEOFF KWOK: Josh, sorry, Geoff Kwok here. We can see that you've shared your screen, but I think it's frozen on our end.

MR CURRAH: Okay. Which slide can you see?

MR KWOK: Just the first slide.

MR CURRAH: Okay. We'll try sharing again.

MS MILLES: How's that?

MR CURRAH: Are you looking at the acknowledgement of country slide?

5 **MR KWOK:** Yes, that's perfect. Thank you.

MR CURRAH: Thank you.

10 **MS DINNING:** That's better.

MR KRSEVAN: Okay. Can you see this one – overview of Recurrent Energy?

MS DINNING: Yes, that's much better. Thank you.

15 **MR KRSEVAN:** Okay. All right. I'll just be brief. I just want to do a quick introduction to Recurrent. We're one of world's largest and most geographically diverse developers, asset owners and operators. So, we've got an industry leading team of in-house experts. We work for the subsidiary of Canadian Solar and we function as Canadian Solar's global development and power services or O&M business.

20 We've got a clear mission. Our mission is to deliver clean, reliable and affordable power to the world, today and tomorrow. We've got an extensive global track record, so we've developed over 12 gigawatts of solar projects, nearly six-and-half gigawatt-hours of battery projects, across six continents.

25 Our power services business or operations and maintenance business operates nearly 15 gigawatts of projects globally. And in Australia, we've been active for more than 10 years in developing, constructing and operating projects. We've got a team of 80 staff across the development and power services business, mainly in Sydney and
30 Melbourne, but also some people based on site as well.

So, our capabilities cover the full lifecycle of projects for both solar and batteries. And as you can see, we've developed a number of projects over the last 10 or so years. This includes Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia and also Victoria. And
35 obviously we're very keen to proceed with Sundown in due course. Thanks very much.

MR CURRAH: Very briefly here, touching on the benefits of Sundown Solar Farm as an SSD. You know, chiefly and most notably is its contributions to the New South Wales electricity grid, so supporting just energy security and reliability across that
40 state. In addition to that, some economic benefits – up to 400 construction jobs generated, and in addition some supplementary local benefits in terms of procurement opportunities and the like, increased economic activity.

45 We've also signed up for a, or have committed to signing up for a VPA with Inverell Shire Council. In addition to that, we see some of our local landholders, they are excited to see the extensive road upgrades and improvements to safety which come with that.

Next slide, please. This slide's just a brief summary of the engagements which we've done. So, as you'd be aware, the original submission, the EIS submission had gone in, in mid-2022, and we received 153 submissions in total. Worth noting less than 45% of those submissions were within 100 kilometres of the site, and that percentage drops even more drastically if we look at within 50 kilometres of the site.

On the left there, you can see an image which summarises the key issues that were raised, highlighting the top three issues. And of course, what we've done in terms of our engagement and subsequent actions since then, is we've looked to address those issues and target engagement of stakeholders with respect to that.

On the right there, you'll see a summary of that engagement. I won't, you know, give you the full chronology, but it is, what we did do is things like meetings, briefings, targeted consultations with sensitive receivers, our landowners and neighbours as well, meeting directly with them. There was also just a broader stakeholder engagement of community groups. One thing I'll highlight is the telephone campaigns where we reached out to 50 plus stakeholders, and the feedback which we got from those campaigns, there were subsequent follow-up meetings with targeted groups, letter drops to landholders within 2 kilometres of the site.

We also did ongoing meetings with the local government agencies, so Inverell and Glen Innes Councils. There were various meetings with them directly, in person and via telecommunications. Additionally, we did engage with 12 plus LGAs along the over-size/over-mass routes.

Just more generally, ongoing consultation that we've been doing throughout the project could include bespoke consultations with local service providers, such as accommodation owners, water supply, gravel quarries, things of that nature.

Next slide. And then just following that engagement. So, as a result of that consultation and in conjunction with the agency feedback we received from the EIS, we made several meaningful changes to our application. A big one to point out here from this slide is a 20% reduction in the project footprint, which helped to reduce impacts to biodiversity ecological communities.

There were, during the Response to Submissions period, additional field surveys and site studies that were undertaken across multiple topics and multiple disciplines. So, again, for biodiversity we carried out multiple threatened species surveys, which were seasonal surveys or targeted surveys for certain species. Other field surveys and work which was done was under the topic of agriculture. So, there we carried out a Level 3 ag assessment as well as a soil resource field survey. That was done to confirm that which we had already put in the EIS that there's no Class 1 agricultural land present on site. Again, those impacts to agricultural were further mitigated by our commitments to include agri-solar (so, sheep grazing) during operations.

Other field work or additional impact assessments done under contamination, we did a preliminary site investigation which included a site survey, confirming that there was low risk associated with that.

With the groundwater supply assessment, site works and amendments included a bore test to confirm that the on-site bore would be capable of providing 50% of our water supply required for construction. The remaining water supply would be serviced by Council.

5

Other important amendments to the application we should touch on is with the traffic and infrastructure. We did a great deal of amendment to our access road through the Council, two council roads which includes Spring Mountain and Sturmans Road. And as well, closer investigation to the over-size/over-mass route, so preparing strategic designs for that over-size/over-mass route through those local government areas which were mentioned earlier.

10

Yes, I think that's all for this slide. I might just point out for the visual impact as well, we did an addendum to the visual impact assessment which confirmed that the surrounding receivers and dwellings, there was no visual impact. So, that was an important addendum as well.

15

This slide we can just quickly go over. The committee has asked for our comments on the Department's Assessment Report. We are generally satisfied with – there is just a clerical error we've made here. They referenced 'Swan Brook' when the correct name for that lot or property is 'Newstead'. Other than that, very satisfied with the Assessment Report generally.

20

I'll just pause here for a moment. This is the section where we're going to be going into the key issues which the committee has asked us to dive a little more deeper into. I might just pause there, if there's any questions you have at this stage, or we can go into those specific topics.

25

MS DINNING: I think we'll wait a little while, because you might actually have responses to some of our questions. So, if you can proceed.

30

MR CURRAH: Very good.

MS DINNING: Thank you.

35

MR CURRAH: Okay. So, this slide deals with land use compatibility. Again, there may be some overlap or repeating to some of those – the changes that we made to the assessment, that previous slide. But here is just a bit more detail, speaking generally.

40

So, this site was selected just as a site which does not contain any primary agricultural lands, so no Class 1 land. And it was selected to avoid those high-value agricultural areas. As mentioned previously, the Submission Report re-confirmed that through a Level 3 assessment and soil resource field surveys. So, that was all done during the Response to Submissions phase, they did confirm that yes, there was no Class 1 land, and the Class 2 land which is there has negligible impact, we say here 0.5% of the disturbance footprint is Class 2 land, so quite minimal.

45

And those areas were looked at, refining, and determined that we – those were basically difficult to avoid because they were mostly used for internal access roads to

traverse from different areas of the site to the other. And areas which were quite undulating and likely to be not suitable for agriculture in any case, those Class 2 lands, the 0.5% of the disturbance footprint. So, that means the bulk of the project sits on the Class 3 landforms. And we further mitigate these impacts by, as we mentioned, the agri-solar sheep grazing throughout operations.

Moving onto traffic and transport. Again, responding to the engagement and submissions we received, we did take a close look at the traffic and transport impacts. They've been carefully assessed and with efforts to mitigate. So, a lot of that included close consultation with the sensitive receivers and neighbouring landholders. One of the means of reducing impacts will be the use of shuttle buses for during construction, so bringing down the number of personal vehicles that are going on site, reducing parking demand there on site as well, but just more so about reducing the number of cars travelling down our access road.

That access road consists of about 8 kilometres of road which we will be upgrading council roads, Spring Mountain and Sturman Roads. So, those roads will be upgraded to be 8.7 metres wide, which accommodates B-doubles and temporarily will allow for an over-size/over-mass vehicle – we anticipate just one of those trips for over-size/over-mass.

Important to mention is the intersection at Gwydir Highway, so that's where the state road meets the council road, there'll be permanent upgrades done to that as well, turning treatments and the like, which provides a greater safety for road users. So, that's a big part of what we focused on with this Response to Submission.

Additionally, the over-size/over-mass route was assessed. As previously mentioned, all the relevant councils were reached out to and strategic designs created for where necessary, where there were going to be roadworks and impacts to road furniture.

That's all for now.

MR KING: So, biodiversity impacts. Biodiversity impacts are being minimised through an avoidance-led design approach by incorporating feedback from CPHR which included the incorporation of vegetation corridors within the development, buffers to watercourses as well as removal of small islands of vegetation. In addition to adopting the more efficient panel technology, we were able to reduce the project footprint by 20%. This further reduced the impact on vegetation communities, such as the Box Gum Woodland.

The BDAR was updated with the revised design, which also included additional seasonal surveys, including targeted flora species in October '23, January '24, and October '24. As well as an assessment of the Eastern pygmy possum in early 2024.

The revised development footprint resulted in a reduction of impact to the Box Gum Woodland, up to 77 hectares. Any remaining residual impacts would be mitigated through the offset via the NSW Biodiveristy Offset Scheme.

Water impacts. The assessments completed for the project identified no significant impacts to watercourses. The design of the project has included buffers to protect waterways, and crossings will be constructed in accordance with the relevant guidelines.

The water required during construction will be sourced from an on-site bore as well as from a council standpipe, and this has been agreed with Council in principle. The water used during construction will be for dust suppression, site amenities, fire protection, as well as washing of plant and equipment.

Waste management. Inverell Council advised that their waste depot may not be able to take all wastes associated with the project and therefore further investigation was required. We engaged with Council on this and committed to a Waste Management Plan for construction, operation and decommissioning. That Waste Management Plan will focus on the waste reduction and the waste hierarchy, so looking at diverting from landfill where possible. There's a condition in the conditions of consent associated with this, and we'll commit to that.

Hazards and risks. A preliminary hazard analysis was completed for the project, and it's including assessment of the risks associated with the BESS, as well as EMF levels. And it's not classified as a hazardous development, and everything is within acceptable industry levels.

A bushfire risk assessment was completed and the recommendations from that ... The recommendations associated with that were incorporated, which included asset protection zones, an on-site source of water with a large tank, as well as the commitment to do a further Fire Management Plan in consultation with the Rural Fire Services and other local fire control centres.

MR CURRAH: So, Josh Currah here again. Social impacts and workers accommodation. So, during the construction duration which would be roughly 21 months expected, a much shorter duration of that we anticipate a peak workforce of 400 employees during construction – again, that's at a smaller sort of peak period. That's a mix of non-local and local from the surrounding, the LGAs there.

So, a condition which we will be committing to is a Workers Accommodation and Employment Strategy, that will be prepared prior to construction. We will be utilising – it'll detail how we'll be utilising the existing sources of accommodation and how that's going to service the project's needs. That is going to be reviewed by both Inverell and Glen Innes councils. We have already engaged with those two councils, they are comfortable with this approach, they have spoken to us on their interest in this area, and we'll continue to sort of liaise with them as that strategy develops prior to construction.

On the topic of noise and vibration. Our noise impact assessment both during the initial EIS and the subsequent Response to Submission identified no expected exceedances of the thresholds in the EPA guidelines. In any case, a Noise and Vibration Management Plan will be utilised when we do construct, just to measure and ensure that those levels are within the predicted noise levels.

We have also made some commitments in terms of mitigation strategies to noise and to vibration. And mainly for vibration, this would be to do with our road upgrade works only. So, prior to commencement of the solar farm construction, we will be upgrading that Spring Mountain and Sturmans Road. So, a very short duration of that will be road upgrades, and that's when the vibration would be closely monitored to ensure that we're not using any vibratory rollers near within 100 metres of any residence along there. On the solar farm side itself, we don't have any nearby, immediately nearby neighbours or residents, so that's less of a concern then, but yes, for the road construction, we'll be closely focusing on the vibration and minimise those impacts.

Some other just construction impacts worth noting generally. We make the distinction here again that the upgrading of the access road and the Gwydir Highway intersection will be a point of great sort of attention from us in terms of minimising impacts. So, dust being a topic there, we've committed to sealing areas adjacent to some of those residences along that road. And then use of water carts, which is pretty standard for a construction project, that there'll be regular use of water carts to keep that dust down. And again, standard for construction, we'll have restriction of traffic speeds on that access road, so the council roads will have a restricted traffic speed and be considered part of the site's Traffic Management Plan.

In addition to that, we recognise some concerns regarding the cattle of the surrounding operations, so replacement of fencing and cattle grids where necessary to ensure the management of that. Safe movement of the vehicles and keeping the livestock safe as well. A commitment in the conditions is a Construction Environmental Management Plan which will detail how the communication with those neighbours and how they're notified throughout the construction project, if they have certain movements that they need as part of their operations, that will be considered as well.

And then just for the construction of the solar farm itself, the project generally is located quite away from sensitive receivers and general public, so it's recessed from the Gwydir Highway and down in a sort of a valley, I guess we'll see this tomorrow during the site inspection more clearly. So, the construction impacts during and directly located in the solar farm site is maybe less of a concern. And then any impacts there will be minimised and managed through the CEMP (the Construction Environmental Management Plan, that is).

MS DINNING: Great. Thank you. I think we might – I've got a few questions, you've got, we might start our questions, and we pass the talking stick between us, and then you can move onto the other parts. And this is not in order of significance or priority, just as I was making some notes.

So, I just want to start with a couple of ones, and one of them is about – there's a mention about agri-solar being done during operation. Who does that – are you the leaseholder or the landholder, or could you just clarify that, please?

MR CURRAH: We hold options for lease over the land where the solar farm is going to go. So, we'll be, yes, holding leases for that land. That is included in the terms of those leases, the ability to do that agri-solar, like run sheep there. Some of that, some

of those leases provide first right of refusal to those landholders as well should they wish to provide the livestock. But in any case, the operations and maintenance team will seek that out when operations commence. So, it's not an activity during construction, it's an activity from when operations commence.

5

MS DINNING: So, the responsibilities for the land, the operation of the solar farm and the agri-solar will be worked out between yourselves and the landowners?

MR CURRAH: Correct.

10

MS DINNING: Or the owner at the time.

MR CURRAH: That's right, yes.

15

MS DINNING: Okay.

MR CURRAH: And as the case may be, a third, like a third-party grazier. I guess the first right of refusal would go to the host landowners, but if they don't take up that opportunity, there may be a third-party grazier as well.

20

MS DINNING: Okay.

MR WRIGHT: Could I ask a supplementary question on that? Is the agri-solar activity an optional activity, or is it an activity that will in any circumstance proceed?

25

MR CURRAH: I do believe it's a ... I'm not sure to what extent it's in the conditions, I believe it is in there. It is a mitigation measure which we've committed to, and I believe it's in the conditions of consent. So, the intent is that yes, it will, it will ...

30

MR WRIGHT: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MS DINNING: Great. Thank you. And as we said at the beginning, if there's anything we need clarification on, we'll send that in writing to you anyway. So, we'll just make a note if there's something not responded to.

35

I have another question around back to housing. And the displacement of some social services. So, I note on your slide presentation, the local [hub? 00:32:27] of the rooms is the motel etc., comfortable, but there might be other services being provided by social enterprises in the areas, and in some cases, temporary accommodation is proffered.

40

I know that the – I think the Glen Innes VPA outlined some of those affordable housing options, but could you perhaps address the issue of the interest in providing temporary accommodation that may be a legacy for that local government area, if in developing the Workforce and Accommodation Strategy – and sorry if I've got the incorrect name, that strategy, it's identified there aren't enough rooms available for your peak workforce.

45

5 **MR CURRAH:** At the moment, yes, our intention or our assessment is that there will be sufficient accommodation available for that peak workforce. We have spoke to some of our tier 1 EPC contractors who are likely to be asked to bid and become the contractor on this project. Their assessment is the same, that we believe that the existing accommodation there can accommodate what we do need.

10 Obviously, the strategy being required prior to construction, it is influenced by the start date of construction and when those peak periods of workforce are required, and making sure that those peaks don't conflict or don't conflict with any other surges in the accommodation needs of the area. But based on the assessments which we've done internally so far, the existing accommodation is sufficient there, and that's the intent.

15 **MS DINNING:** So, if I could just pursue that a little more. If it turns out during the discussions about the strategy that the, what the locals need is going to be displaced by what this project needs, are you open to any discussions about temporary workforce accommodation?

20 **MR CURRAH:** We may just take that one on notice. We haven't considered that in our planning or modelling. But happy to take a direct question of that on notice.

MS DINNING: Okay, thanks. What we'll do after this is we'll formulate how we wish to ask that, so we'll send that to you. After, we'll have a discussion about that.

25 **MR CURRAH:** Yes. And we're happy to provide more information, I guess, that we've gotten comfortable with what's available at the local level now.

30 **MR WRIGHT:** And Josh, I notice that you mentioned being able to take account of other accommodation needs in the respective LGAs. We had a meeting with councils, both Inverell and Glen Innes earlier today, they talked about some peak tourism events which occur. For example, I think it was the Australian Celtic Festival in Glen Innes with an influx of about 3,000 people.

MS DINNING: Three to five thousand.

35 **MR WRIGHT:** Three to five thousand. So, I'm just curious to know whether there's an ability on the part of Recurrent Energy to flex where its workforce is overnighting in response to those other pushes in terms of accommodation.

40 **MR CURRAH:** Yes, no, you've hit the nail on the head, and maybe one thing that we didn't fully focus on and should have spoke more to, is that, yes, we have spoke to Inverell and Glen Innes on this topic, they've obviously raised that and pointed out their various yearly festivals that they're quite proud of. And yes, we want to make sure we don't have any undue sort of impact on their needs for the tourism accommodation. And yes, when we were speaking with our potential EPCs, one thing
45 that we spoke about was the ability to potentially slide or modify the peak workforce or flatten the curve of the peak workforce.

Again, this strategy will be influenced by when the construction start date is, so that's why, I guess, having the strategy come closer to the commencement of construction is

good, so that we understand when it starts and when the peaks will be, whether it requires to be shifted or flattened or re-tooled in some way so that they can strategically plan those peak periods of workforce.

5 So, it doesn't necessarily just have to fall where it has to fall. The EPC can make it suit sort of what's been possible. But we aware of those festivals which you mentioned in Glen Innes.

10 **MR WRIGHT:** We'd be interested in the adoption by Recurrent Energy of more efficient panels and how that would appear to allow the proposal to have a smaller footprint without necessarily compromising hugely on power performance. Can you just – and that's been beneficial, as far as I understand, in terms of being able to minimise impact on biodiversity. Can you maybe just step that out for us in some more detail?

15 **MR SINGH:** Yes, sure, It's Anil here, I can answer that question. So, look, with regards to the modules and the solar panel sizes, with that better new technology, it's advancing quite rapidly. So, for example, we had, earlier on in this project when we modelled on a 500 to 600-watt solar panel, so this technology advanced since the last
20 three or four years, where we now, we can have 700 to 800-watt solar panels.

So, you can imagine, a 10% uplift in the wattage of the solar panel would now basically constrain the footprint requirements for the same amount of power per square metre as would be required. So, that technology, that advancement has now allowed us
25 to optimise the footprint, to still maintain our 360-megawatt output, and also other optimisation in regards to the [unintelligible 00:38:49] as well, that allowed us to still maintain our energy yield.

30 **MR WRIGHT:** Okay. Thank you.

MS DINNING: Thank you. You go first, I'll ...

35 **MR WRIGHT:** Well, just in – and thanks for the overview of the way you've responded to some of those biodiversity issues. Obviously, one of the key outcomes would appear to be avoiding fragmentation of habitat. I note the requirement to – and there's obviously a safety requirement in terms of perimeter fencing. The actual disturbance footprint is a quite organic shape, so it'll be – I'm sure it'll be challenging putting that fencing in.

40 I think one of the requirements I know CPHR were looking for was cumulative opportunities for wildlife movement. Despite the erection of that fencing, I'm thinking, are you able to talk to that at all, how that's going to work?

45 **MR CURRAH:** We have looked into this, and yes, there is in the layout, you will see some certain wildlife corridors that have been maintained. So, the fencing – it's not to say that we'll have a single perimeter fence around all of the island or the solar farm area and disturbance footprint, there will be discrete sort of fencing used to maintain those wildlife corridors between the kind of key blocks or key sections that you see in that layout.

So, we have spoke with our consultant on those wildlife corridors as to what they might look like, how that might done. There can be some creative ways to do the fencing or create/maintain those corridors.

5

MR WRIGHT: Okay. And you can do that without compromising unauthorised access?

10 **MR CURRAH:** That's right. So, you'd still have all of your, for electrical safety reasons, you have to have the panels fully enclosed, but it just may not be as one major big compound, it will be more specific.

MR WRIGHT: I see, I see. Yes. Thank you.

15 **MS DINNING:** I have a question but, sorry, I'm trying to find the reference. At some point you mentioned the quarry, a quarry – help me here, sorry, I'm going through ...

MR CURRAH: Yes, it might have been during the engagement slide. Yes.

20 **MS DINNING:** The engagement?

MR CURRAH: Yes, that's right. So, that was just –

25 **MS DINNING:** Oh yes, it was, yes, sorry, it was bespoke consultation with local service providers, including accommodation, water supply, gravel quarry.

MR CURRAH: Yes.

30 **MS DINNING:** Yes.

MR CURRAH: We had people reach out to us, local service providers who put their hand up, we have this to offer, whether it's civil contractor or we have a gravel pit which already has a permit. So, we take these expressions of interest and we sort of keep them on file. This is just an example, I guess, of some of the consultation we've had with those. Aside from the key activities which we highlighted which we are actively doing the campaigns, reaching out, letter drops, there were other conversations with local service providers just to see whether they could contribute, and we keep that information about. One of those was the local gravel quarry.

40 **MS DINNING:** Okay, great. Look, thank you for that clarification. Thank you.

MR WRIGHT: Just while we're talking about consultation. R14, a sensitive receiver on Spring Mountain Road, looking at their submission, they don't appear to have been happy with how engagement has happened, and suggesting that they perhaps weren't aware of this until later in the process. Can you talk to that at all?

45

MR CURRAH: R14, yes. That being [REDACTED]?

MR WRIGHT: The [REDACTED] family, that's correct, yes.

MR CURRAH: Yes. I have to take on notice which one specifically that is, but I ...

MR WRIGHT: Yes, the [REDACTED] family on Spring Mountain Road.

MR CURRAH: Okay. Yes. We have had – yes, I recall the original submission during the EIS stage, as part of the 150 submissions we did receive. And we did in, obviously, the subsequent time we followed up directly with them. There has been some email correspondence back and forth and commitments made on the mitigation measures.

Some of those mitigation measures which we've mentioned to you already have come through the Response to Submission process. Sealing off of a portion of the access road, the council access road to suppress dust. One of those specific areas of sealing will be in front of R14, so that's one thing that we ... And I do think maybe that the original submission didn't quite have all of that information, and certainly the conversation we've had since then we've made it more clear, I suppose, what our efforts will be on mitigation.

So, yes, the sealing of the road and other dust suppression matters, so the water trucks, if there are any impacts to existing cattle fence in upgrading that access road, we will be replacing like-for-like, and we've made that clear in current written, in email, that commitment. So, just trying to provide comfort, I suppose, that we are committing to those actions and obviously keeping and controlling their livestock is important to us, via safe vehicle movement and keeping the livestock safe. So, there has been certainly subsequent consultation with that receiver.

MR WRIGHT: Okay.

MR CURRAH: We'd be happy to provide any record of that consultation as well, if that's ...

MR WRIGHT: That would be useful.

MS DINNING: I think that would be useful.

MR WRIGHT: Yes. Very useful.

MS DINNING: Yes. So, we'll put that in our list of questions.

MR CURRAH: Yes.

MR WRIGHT: And so, I know, that respondent was concerned amongst other things about livestock crossing Spring Mountain Road and potentially, you know, interesting with construction traffic. Is there an agreed solution for dealing with that particular problem?

MR CURRAH: So, we do, as I sort of said, we've, as part of our discussions not only with them but with other – with Council more generally, is upgrading of the cattle grids, the existing cattle grids or cattle ramps, depending on the terminology that you

might use. So, along that access road, all those will be upgraded to make sure they're suitable for the B-double and all the upgrades that we're going to be doing.

5 Again, the discussions we've had with Council and with the receivers along that road is should there be a need to impact some of the exclusion fencing that exists, we would be replacing them like-for-like and making sure that that fencing is maintained there. And if there's specific mustering or cattle movement that's required, that will be managed in the Construction and Traffic Management Plan and there'll be a way for receivers to get in touch with the project manager or site manager and coordinate any
10 movements, should that be necessary. And then the EPC, through that management plan would move their deliveries and move their movements around that.

MS MILLES: And I'll just add in addition to that – it's Chelsea Milles here – if there's any parts of that road that are unfenced, we would be more than happy to work
15 with those receivers along that road to look at putting in some fencing in an effort to obviously increase the safety for vehicle movements but also for any cattle in that area.

MR WRIGHT: Yes. Thank you.

20 **MR CURRAH:** Yes, I think as part of the upgrade to that road, there would be an assessment on the current sort of fencing and whether they're insufficient for excluding.

MS DINNING: Thank you. Would you like to proceed with the other items, because I
25 note the time. We're ...

MS MILLES: Sure.

MS DINNING: You've got existing transmission infrastructure, I think.
30

MS MILLES: Yes. So, the project will connect to the existing 330 kV transmission line, Armidale to Dumaresq. So, this line does traverse the site. So, it's a direct connection to the line via a new project substation. Notably, we have gone through the full GPS process with Transgrid and AEMO and we have received GPS approval
35 (5.3.4 approval) in April of this year. So, we're now proceeding with negotiating our connection agreements.

40 So, the VPA has been discussed with Inverell Council over the last sort of 12 to 18 months. So, the VPA does conform to the NSW Benefits Sharing Guideline and also the Inverell Council's Community Benefit Sharing Framework, they have their own policy around VPAs. So, we've made that commitment for \$850 per megawatt per year, which in today's terms is over \$10 million over the life of the project.

45 And so, as I mentioned, Inverell Council does have a dedicated framework which we've obviously reviewed with them. And it sort of discusses what some of the funding will go towards, you know, community facilities, affordable housing, scholarship programs and the like.

And just quickly, comments on the Department's conditions of consent. So yes, we are very much, so broadly happy with those and aligned. There is a couple of minor clerical items that we just wanted to tidy up, essentially there's just a date reference under A15 that we want to correct, to make sure we're referencing the right letter. And then under the Schedule of Lands, there's just a double up on one of the lot numbers. So, hopefully nice and easy to round out.

So, that's the end of our presentation, so we're happy to move through to questions now, any further questions.

MR WRIGHT: I've got a question.

MS DINNING: You've got a question. Yes.

MR WRIGHT: Just in terms of – and it's good to hear that the disturbance footprint for the project is set back from riparian corridors. I was thinking that I had read somewhere that Recurrent Energy were committed to undertaking some rehabilitation works along those corridors. Is that correct? Would you be looking to do any proactive work to actually improve the condition of those riparian corridors?

MR CURRAH: We can take that one on notice, I don't think that's in our submission anywhere. Maybe the mix-up there is the offset credits, so as part of the BDAR, we do have to commit to some certain number of offset credits that we will be acquiring prior to construction.

MR WRIGHT: Okay, yes, if you could take that on notice, that'd be good.

MS DINNING: We'll add that to the little list, yes.

MR WRIGHT: And I've got one last question, Sarah, sorry. Just in terms of traffic speeds along Spring Mountain Road, I think it's currently, in theory, 100 kilometres. Are you looking to reduce that speed for construction traffic? Do you know – and maybe this is going to come out in detail in your Construction Traffic Management Plan, but to what speed and how would you look to ensure that was effectively adhered to by your contractors and subcontractors?

MR CURRAH: I think that is detailed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan, which is part of – that is the management plan which you've already drafted, that is in the EIS. I'm sorry I can't, I forget off the top of my head the exact kilometres-per-hour that that prescribes.

MS MILLES: We can obviously come back to you on that.

MR CURRAH: Yes.

MR WRIGHT: It just goes to one of the issues that R14 has raised, for example, about vehicles –

MR CURRAH: Yes. And that Traffic Management Plan sort of details how that's prescribed and how that's enforced with all of its contractors and subcontractors.

MR WRIGHT: We'll have a look at that in some more detail.

MR CURRAH: Yes.

MR WRIGHT: Thank you.

MS DINNING: Great. Thank you. I'll just check – Jane, do you have any ...

MS JANE ANDERSON: Nothing from me, thank you.

MS DINNING: Geoff, do you have any?

MR KWOK: I just have one question, if that's okay. You referenced before about the Department's recommended condition on the Waste Management Plan, and in that particular condition, the way it's drafted it does say that this requirement to identify appropriately licensed waste and resource management facility. So, noting that Inverell Council's waste facility is at capacity, have you looked at other alternative facilities in the area that might have the capacity, and have you engaged with them at all?

MR CURRAH: We would need to know – we had reached out during the Response to Submissions period to a couple of facilities. The general feedback is they need to know the waste streams that they'd be dealing with, and amounts, which at this time, prior to us engaging the EPC, we don't have with any certainty, I guess, the waste streams and those amounts. But yes, generally I think they were open to servicing or helping to service those needs.

MR KWOK: Okay. Thank you.

MS DINNING: Thank you. All right. Well, this will wrap up this part of our considerations. Thank you very much for your time and the presentation today. We're doing stakeholder engagement meetings today, as you know, so we've got another one with the Department after this. And then tomorrow we'll have the site visit and we'll see some of you there at the site visit.

And submissions can be made until midnight on the 8th of July, so we let people, and the website let's people know that there's still up until the 8th of July to make submissions. So, these will form part of our consideration. We'll have a discussion this afternoon about the questions, that now we've had this discussion, which questions we'll send you, because we might amongst ourselves decide we've heard that in another way. So, we'll get those questions back out to you, as mentioned.

So, again, thank you very much for your time and the information.

[Multiple people say thank you/goodbye]

THE MEETING CONCLUDED