

Hawkesdale Wind Farm Community Engagement Committee

Meeting date Monday 17 April 2023
 Meeting time and location 7.30pm at the Hawkesdale Memorial Hall

1. Welcome

2. Present

Cr Damian Gleeson (Chair)
 Maxine Keane, Community Representative
 John Bos, Community Representative
 Anne-Maree Huglin, HADDAC Representative
 Debra Dumesny, GPG Community and Stakeholder Engagement Officer
 Haridian Cabrera, GPG Community Stakeholder Engagement and Local Economic Development
 Brendan Ryan, Hawkesdale Wind Farm Site Manager (Guest)
 Daniel Cullen, Environment and Safety, GPG (Guest)

Vicki Askew-Thornton, CEC Responsible Officer, Moyne Shire

3. Apologies

George Swarbrick, Community Representative
 Bruce Mirtschin, Community Representative

4. Declarations of Interest

Nil.

5. Confirmation of Minutes of 27 February 2023 meeting

Moved by Debra Dumesny, seconded by Anne-Maree Huglin that the minutes of the CEC meeting held on 27 February 2023 be accepted. **CARRIED**

6. Business arising from the previous Minutes

Responsible	Action
GPG	Provide a copy of the BAMP once it is endorsed by the Minister. Refer to 9.1 Project Update
GPG	Follow up with DTP regarding the 80km speed restriction. Refer to 9.1 Project Update
GPG	Provide information on why the foundations won't be removed when the wind farm is being decommissioned. Refer to 9.1 Project Update
GPG	Provide information on whether the foundations are engineered to Australian Standards. Refer to 9.1 Project Update

GPG	Provide a copy of the current shadow flicker assessment. GPG tabled a copy at the meeting. Additional copies can be provided to members on request. The document is also available on the project website https://hawkesdalewindfarm.globalpower-generation.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Appendix-P-Shadow-Flicker-and-Blade-Glint-Assessment.pdf
Council	Completed: Council has resumed posting 6 hard copies of confirmed CEC minutes to the Hawkesdale Post Office.

7. Correspondence Incoming

Date	Item	Attachment Number
3 March	Unconfirmed minutes emailed to CEC members	
6, 13, 20, 27 March	HDWF project updates from GPG	
5 April	Question on notice from Anne-Maree Huglin on behalf of HADDAC: <i>Re: Wind farm Community Engagement Committee Code of Conduct in particular around signing document and ability to ask questions that are not listed in the agenda: Are other members other than community members (excluding Council members) required to sign document?</i>	
6 April	HDWF newsletter March 2023	
10 April	Questions on notice from John Bos	1
Tabled at the meeting by Anne-Maree	Letter from HADDAC with further questions about the Code of Conduct	2
Tabled at the meeting by Council	Copies of the report considered by Council at its March meeting regarding the Code of Conduct and updated CEC Charters	
Tabled at the meeting by GPG	Copy of the <i>Shadow Flicker and Blade Glint Assessment (2021)</i>	

Summary of discussion about the CEC Code of Conduct and new Charters adopted by Council at the March 2023 Council meeting:

Questions submitted by John Bos for Council:

All community representatives, as well as two representatives from GPG, are required to sign the code of conduct or else forfeit their position on the CEC. It is noted that at times, GPG has other staff present to supply information to the meeting which I, and probably most others present, accept is a good practice. I note that others may attend the meeting electronically.

Q: Will these other attendees be required to sign the code if indeed they speak at the meeting?

Will these persons be required to sign the code of conduct and accept all the conditions attached?

Council response: It is not intended that additional proponent representatives who attend meetings as (approved) guests will have to sign the Code of Conduct. However, the GPG guests in attendance noted that they would be happy to voluntarily sign the Code of Conduct.

If a meeting was to be held electronically only CEC members, and guests that have been approved by the Chair prior to the meeting, would be invited.

Q: Will spectators be required to sign the code of conduct?

Council response: The CEC Charter does not allow for spectators to attend CEC meetings.

I assume electronic attendees would also be required to sign the code. Ironically, given the shires code regarding secrecy, it would appear electronic attendees could no longer 'attend' the meeting as there is no way of knowing who else is privy to information via zoom.

Council response: If a meeting was to be held electronically only CEC members, and guests that have been approved by the Chair prior to the meeting, would be invited.

Q: Was GPG consulted regarding the Moyne Shire code of conduct prior to its submission to council?

Response: No.

Q: Why does GPG in its newsletter indicate letters regarding joining the HDWF benefit committee have gone out to people within a 10km radius of Hawkesdale (which was the distance previous mentioned) yet I know of people in Woolsthorpe some 15 km away who have received the letter. Areas such as Minhamite which are on the school bus run and therefore associated with the school, have association with the Hawkesdale CFA group and are within the Hawkesdale 3287 post code were not contacted.

Who actually was sent the letters and who organised the distribution? How far from Hawkesdale were they actually sent? Why were they sent to a town 15km away where another Wind Farm and potentially another benefit fund may ensue?

Council response: As requested by GPG, the letters were sent to all landholders within 10km of the wind farm site. If they wish to, CEC members can provide information about the nomination process to interested people who reside outside the 10km area.

Questions submitted by John Bos for GPG:

Q. Does GPG believe a code of conduct drawn up by council should be implemented at the Hawkesdale CEC and if so, why, considering its apparent successful involvement with other CEC's? That being said, could GPG explain how it deals with problems which may occur at other CEC meetings?

GPG response: As this committee was established and is being run by the Council, GPG understands the need to sign the Council's Code of Conduct. In the community engagement committees related to other GPG projects that have been established and directly run by the GPG team, we have developed our code of conduct specifically for each Committee.

GPG also has its own code of conduct that it is applicable for all the employees.

Questions submitted by HADDAC on 5 April:

1. A view that the following section of the Charter takes away the ability to ask questions at the meeting that were not listed in the agenda:
Meeting Procedure
a) Questions on Notice
Questions on Notice are to be submitted at least 7 days prior to a meeting, or deferred to the following meeting.

Council Response: This was already in the Charter, not added recently.

The intent of this section is moreso in relation to:

- **More complex questions, where the intended responder will most likely need more time to prepare a response than is available in a meeting.**
 - **Submitting more complex questions at least 7 days before meetings will reduce the amount of questions having to be taken on notice during the meetings.**
 - **It does not mean that questions cannot be asked during a meeting.**
2. A view that the section of the Charter won't enable a member to raise a listed agenda item with an interested member of the public during the week before a meeting.

Council response: The intent of this section is that agendas with attachments not be forwarded to non-members before the upcoming meeting, at which they can be discussed in more detail. It does not mean that members cannot discuss listed agenda items with non-members during the week leading up to a meeting.

Questions submitted by HADDAC on 17 April (Att. 2):

1. Why do CEC members have to sign the Code of conduct when there was one already operating?

Council response: This is the first Code of Conduct that Council has introduced for proponent and community representatives on CECs.

2. Will the '21 day sign or be removed' be enforced?
Will all CEC members including GPG reps have to sign this document?
Council response: Section 8 of the Code requires all proponent and community representatives to sign the Code of Conduct within 21 days of receiving it if they wish to remain as members of their CECs.

3. Will there be any future ramifications for members who do sign this document?
Council response: The expectations of CEC members is set out in detail in the Code of Conduct.

4. Having a pre arranged Agenda is supported but is there the ability to raise questions not listed on the agenda? HADDAC realizes sometimes answers will need to put on notice to give relevant officers or representatives to research the right response.

Council response: As per usual, questions not listed on the agenda can be raised at meetings.

Summary of discussion:

Council noted that the new Charters and the Code of Conduct were adopted at its meeting held on 28 March. A copy of the Council Officer's report, the draft Code of Conduct and the draft Charter can be found on Council's website at:

<https://www.moyne.vic.gov.au/files/assets/public/documents/minutes-and-agendas/agendas/2023-03-28-ordinary-council-meeting-agendawebsite.pdf>

Two actions were required following the Council meeting:

- The new Charters to be signed and sealed.
- The Code of Conduct to be updated to reflect the additional '14 day' section that was added to the motion that Council supported.
- Council will post copies of the Code of Conduct and the new Charter to all community and proponent CEC members as soon as possible.

If an alternative HADDAC representative is to attend a CEC meeting, they will be required to sign the Code of Conduct.

8. Correspondence Outgoing

Nil.

9. Reports:

9.1 GPG Project Update

1. Questions on Notice

• Bat and Avifauna Management Plan (BAMP)

The BAMP is currently with the minister for endorsement.

There were some minor amendments required to the plan, these will be completed this week and the plan returned to the department for endorsement. We are hopeful that it will be available at the next CEC meeting.

- John noted he had received advice from Nature Advisory at the open day that the only flora and fauna surveys done were along the transmission line route. GPG confirmed this was incorrect, and that avifauna studies had been done for an area extending to 15kms from the wind farm site.

Cr Gleeson requested that GPG provide the CEC with a summary of the avifauna studies and a copy of the endorsed BAMP to the CEC members if it is received prior to the next meeting.

• Rationale for the 80kph zone

The assessment conducted for the development of the endorsed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) identified that a reduction in speed would reduce the risk of a traffic incident

The movement of vehicles between the batch plant – northern side – to the construction on the southern side will increase the risk and the speed reduction will address this

The permanent 80kph signs have been installed.

- The 80km speed restriction will be removed once the wind farm construction is completed.

• Engineering of a foundation – Australian standards

The design of the foundations is:

- engineered by Esteyco, a Spanish company specialized in the design of foundations for wind farms, in accordance with international and Australian references, codes and standards
- verified by DNV, an independent Australian engineering company prior to construction, confirming that the design is in line with the following standards:
 - ✓ Australian AS 1170.4-2007 - earthquake design category
 - ✓ Australian AS3600:2018 - concrete works
 - ✓ Australian AS/NZ 4671 - steel reinforcement grade

The calculations and the verifications are the following:

- Vestas Technical - specifications to fulfil, including the foundation design loads
- Geotechnical Verifications - Bearing capacity and Rotational Stiffness
- Structural design - Stability and gap verifications and Finite Elements Model

- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q2o5P-6zm6Y>

- **Why are the foundations left in the ground after decommissioning?**

The permit states that all above ground assets must be removed to a depth of 1 metre

The disruption to the environment and the landowner would greatly increase if the foundations are fully removed

Discussions on the removal of assets at decommissioning is agreed individually with each landowner and included in the confidential landowner agreement

- Topsoil could be imported to backfill the holes left from the removal of the turbines and any infrastructure up to one metre in depth.
- The Permit requires a decommissioning plan to be submitted to the Minister for Planning prior to any decommissioning works being undertaken.
- If the project is sold, the landowner agreements and the Permit would transfer to the new owner.

- **Shadow flicker**

The shadow flicker report is available on the web site at [Relevant Documentation | Hawkesdale Wind Farm \(globalpower-generation.com.au\)](https://www.globalpower-generation.com.au)

A complete hard copy is available tonight

An electronic copy can be sent to individuals if required

2. Project update – wind farm



- ✓ Excavation on 20 turbine sites and access tracks under progress including those on the southern side of the wind farm
 - ✓ Temporary and permanent fencing continues
 - ✓ Wash down bays installed for vehicles entering the site at designated points to meet bio security controls
 - ✓ Batch plant operational
 - ✓ First turbine foundation pour scheduled for April 28, blinding and foundation preparation will occur earlier
- ✓ Cable laying equipment is being delivered for the internal cable network
 - ✓ Reo and anchor cages arriving to site
 - ✓ Sofia Rojas has joined the team at Hawkesdale, her role is Environment and Safety
 - ✓ Veterans in construction have 8 people from the district working on site
 - ✓ The large transformer for the terminal station will be delivered in the next few weeks.





3. Work hours

- Civil construction earthworks have now commenced to construct the access tracks and hardstands. Generally, the civil contractor will be working:

- ✓ Monday to Friday 7am to 6pm
- ✓ Saturday 7am to 4pm (regular)
- ✓ Sunday & Public holidays 7am to 4pm (occasional as required)

- Saturday afternoon (1pm to 4pm) and Sunday works will be restricted to “managed impact” and “low impact” works as defined by the EPA guidelines.
- The purpose of weekend work is to reduce the overall construction duration, and subsequently the duration of impact on the local community.

- There is flexibility for longer work hours including 5am starts, for particular works such as foundation pours and turbine erection.
GPG will provide information about the predicted timeline for the completion of all foundation pours.

4. Community engagement & communication

✓ Community engagement

- The Community Information Day held on March 8 was very successful and especially interesting to the school children who attended.
- Weekly construction updates are being emailed and uploaded to the Hawkesdale wind farm web page
- March newsletter available
- Quarterly report in the Warrnambool Standard from May

✓ Benefit sharing

✓ Donations

- GPG took part in a Royal Children's Hospital fund raising event on site organised by BMD (main civil contractor). \$7,500 was donated on behalf of the 4 Victorian projects (Hawkesdale, Ryan Corner, Berrybank 1 and 2 wind farms).

✓ Community benefit funds

- Hawkesdale township – from construction
- Broader district – 1 year after operation. Application for membership to the Community Benefit Fund Committee are being received. Applications close 21/04/2023
- Guidelines for eligibility for fund recipients to be finalised when committee is formed

- GPG will select the community benefit fund committee members from the nominations it receives.
John asked that GPG consult with HADDAC regarding possible projects for funding. The CEC community representatives suggested that GPG invite HADDAC to have a representative on the committee.
GPG noted it will expect community benefit fund committee members to advocate for benefit to the community as a whole rather than the benefit of any particular community group they may be a member of.
- Anne-Maree noted that she had the impression the CEC would be more involved in formulating how the fund committee would operate.

Question on notice from John Bos:

Q. To date, I have not been made aware of any formal document which outlines the community funds process as it pertains to Hawkesdale. Of interest, an official document showing the amounts for each benefit with the inclusion of a CPI clause for each should be available.

GPG responded that there is CPI applied to the funding.

Also, GPG indicated the funds will be available for the life of the project. I understand GPG believe the project will be under their control for the life of the project, however nothing is ever certain. What, if any formal arrangement has been made to ensure the continuation of the funding process should GPG sell off, or otherwise no longer be in control of the project?

GPG responded that all conditions of the lease are transferrable in the instance that the wind farm is sold.

✓ Complaints Investigation and Response Plan (CIRP)

The CIRP was endorsed on December 6 2022 and can be found on our web site at <https://hawkesdalewindfarm.globalpower-generation.com.au/> following the link The Project>Relevant documentation.

All relevant documentation and forms for lodging a complaint are found on the web site under Contact Us.

Complaints can be made in the following ways:

Phone: 1800 457 181 or 0428 867 646

E-mail: debra.dumesny@globalpower-generation.com.au

hawkesdalewindfarm@globalpower-generation.com.au

Mail: Hawkesdale Asset Trusts

Suite A, Level 3, 73 Northbourne Avenue,

9.2 Community Members:

Nothing further.

9.3 Council:

Nothing further.

10. General business

Nil.

11. Summary of actions from the meeting

Responsible	Action
GPG	Provide the CEC with a summary of the bat and avifauna studies and a copy of the endorsed BAMP to the CEC members if it is received prior to the next meeting.
GPG	Provide information about the predicted timeline for the completion of all foundation pours.

Next meeting – Monday 29 May 2023, 5.30pm at the Hawkesdale Memorial Hall – Supper Room

Confirmed this / /

Chair

Minutes are to be registered in Moyne Shire's electronic document management system by the committee reporting officer immediately following the Minutes' confirmation and signing

Attachment 1 – Questions on notice from John Bos

Questions on notice for 17/04/2023 Hawkesdale CEC

Could these concerns be brought up at the next CEC meeting.

Moyne Shire council has prepared a code of conduct for CEC's.

I spoke with GPG's community rep regarding this code last week and requested a copy of the GPG code of conduct if one existed so as to compare it with the one envisaged by council. I was told she was unsure of the existence of a code but would chase it up. She went on to say it is possible one does not exist and that GPG successfully conducts numerous other community engagement committees apparently without directives from a third party e.g. councils. As numerous people have indicated their concern about certain aspects of this code, and as a community representative, could the following questions be asked?

From what I can see, the main concerns are as follows:

All community representatives, as well as two representatives from GPG, are required to sign the code of conduct or else forfeit their position on the CEC. It is noted that at times, GPG has other staff present to supply information to the meeting which I, and probably most others present, accept is a good practice. I note that others may attend the meeting electronically.

Will these other attendees be required to sign the code if indeed they speak at the meeting?

Will these persons be required to sign the code of conduct and accept all the conditions attached?

Will spectators be required to sign the code of conduct?

I assume electronic attendees would also be required to sign the code. Ironically, given the shires code regarding secrecy, it would appear electronic attendees could no longer 'attend' the meeting as there is no way of knowing who else is privy to information via zoom.

What is GPG's opinion on this matter?

Was GPG consulted regarding the Moyne Shire code of conduct prior to its submission to council?

Does GPG believe a code of conduct drawn up by council should be implemented at the Hawkesdale CEC and if so, why, considering its apparent successful involvement with other CEC's?

That being said, could GPG explain how it deals with problems which may occur at other CEC meetings?

I spoke with a Marshall Day representative recently and was told they are unaware of any biodiversity study other than along the transmission line corridor.

I am still awaiting the biodiversity study for Hawkesdale. Could GPG follow up as to when it might be available?

To date, I have not been made aware of any formal document which outlines the community funds process as it pertains to Hawkesdale. Of interest, an official document showing the amounts for each benefit with the inclusion of a CPI clause for each should be available. Also, GPG indicated the funds will be available for the life of the project. I understand GPG believe the project will be under their control for the life of the project, however nothing is ever certain. What, if any formal arrangement has been made to ensure the continuation of the funding process should GPG sell off, or otherwise no longer be in control of the project?

Why does GPG in its newsletter indicate letters regarding joining the HDWF benefit committee have gone out to people within a 10km radius of Hawkesdale (which was the distance previous mentioned) yet I know of people in Woolsthorpe some 15 km away who have received the letter. Areas such as Minhamite which are on the school bus run and therefore associated with the school, have association with the Hawkesdale CFA group and are within the Hawkesdale 3287 post code were not contacted.

Who actually was sent the letters and who organised the distribution?

How far from Hawkesdale were they actually sent?

Why were they sent to a town 15km away where another Wind Farm and potentially another benefit fund may ensue?

Thankyou;

John Bos

Attachment 2

President: Mr Steve Stewart
Kings Rd
HAWKESDALE 3287
Ph: 55607248 (Home)
0427607248



Secretary: Mr Frank Huglin
266 Minjah Road
HAWKESDALE 3287
Ph: 55607232 (Home)
0429607232

17/04/2023

HADDAC Concerns and queries re recent voted on Code of Conduct

To CEO Moyne Shire
Cc Hawkesdale Windfarm CEC

Dear CEO Mr Brett Davis and members of the Hawkesdale CEC,

At HADDAC's monthly April meeting the new Code of Conduct was raised.

There were a couple of issues HADDAC would like clarified.

Why do CEC members have to sign the Code of conduct when there was one already operating. Will the 21 day sign or be removed be enforced? Will all CEC members including GPG reps have to sign this document?
Will there be any future ramifications for members who do sign this document?

HADDAC strongly supports the thrust of showing respect while having the ability to ask questions or raise concerns without fear or favour.

Having a pre arranged Agenda is supported but is there the ability to raise questions not listed on the agenda? HADDAC realizes sometimes answers will need to put on notice to give relevant officers or representatives to research the right response.

Thanking you for your time
Regards
Frank Huglin
Secretary HADDAC

