

Action Items

Collector Wind Farm Forum

Date	July 26, 2017	Time	6.30pm – Bushranger Hotel, Collector
-------------	---------------	-------------	--------------------------------------

Attendees

Greg Smith (GS) Chair	Tony Walsh (TW)	John Bell (JB) ULSC -Observer
Neil Weston (NW) Ratch Australia	Tom Mitchell (NW) Ratch Australia	
Martha Truelove (MT)	Gary Poile (GP)	
James McKay (JMck)	Richard Stacy (RS)	

Apologies

Deborah Cameron (DC)	John Hoskins (JH)	Sharon Swincer (SS)
Brian Mor (BM)	Brian McCormack (BM) ULSC	Mark Fleming (MF)

No.	Action	Responsibility	Due Date
1	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS Interim Chair in the absence of DC Apologies as listed above It was noted that as BM was unable to attend due to a family funeral, JB is attending in his place, as an observer 	Note	
2	<p>Introductions, pecuniary interests, minutes from the last meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new pecuniary interest statements were made Action items from the April 19 2017 Meeting were accepted as an accurate account of the meeting Minutes of the last meetings are being placed on the Forum website 	Note (NW)	
3	<p>Correspondence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence from BM in his capacity as Mayor of the Upper Lachlan Shire Council (ULSC) raising a number of issues about the role and authority of the Forum in relation to administering the Community Enhancement Fund (CEF), and potentially inviting other government authorities than the UL SC to join 	Note	

	<p>the Forum was discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While noting that ULSC is now represented at the Forum, the Chair was requested to prepare a response to ULSC indicating the origins of the role of the Forum within the relevant legislation and conditions of consent to the project, and highlighting the provisions in the relevant guidelines in relation to non-attendance. • Correspondence from the Planning and Environment Department stating that the Collector CCC can continue in its existing form and with its existing membership – and that it is not necessary to readvertise the membership positions – and thanking the members of the CCC for their continued services was noted. • NW indicated that these issues around the membership and structure of the CCC are now history, that Ratch encourages the Council to be fully involved and that the CCC should continue its work to maximise opportunities for community participation in the project. 	<p>GS/DC</p> <p>Note</p>	<p>ASAP</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Project update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NW outlined the work Ratch is undertaking in both wind and solar developments in Queensland, noting that the same contractor as will be working on the Collector Windfarm is working with them in Queensland. • While having a CCC is not a requirement in Queensland, Ratch has established a similar structure at the Mount Emerald project, and is drawing on learnings from the experience of the Collector initiative to inform that work in establishing a similar fund. In that case, the fund is being managed directly by Ratch as there is no intermediary body (such as a local council) required. • In relation to the Collector project, Ratch is continuing to work with Vestas the engineering firm involved on the design and development of the project. This partner company are demonstrating their commitment by putting their own funds into the project, and both companies are keen to see the project up and running. • Central to achieving that will be finding a purchaser in the energy market to commit to buying the energy developed from the Farm, and Ratch is actively pursuing multiple avenues to achieve potential 		

	<p>offtake agreements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The broader energy market is changing, and Ratch’s Australian projects are leading their international investment in renewable energy. More banks are also now coming into the energy market, and pricing is changing making the Collector project more attractive and competitive. • In coming months NW will be spending more time on the Collector project as his main responsibility, and focusing on some of the more practical implementation aspects needed to get to a commencement point. • While there are still significant elements of uncertainty, NW indicated that by around the end of the first quarter of 2018 construction could potentially be starting on the project. • JMck requested that a map indicating the reduced number of turbines now proposed for the project be added to the Ratch website. NW undertook to make that change. • GP requested that the Forum particularly note the clash of dates which had occurred with the Gunning Solar Project, preventing members of the CCC from attending their meeting. 	<p>NW</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>ASAP</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Community Enhancement Fund (CEF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The outcomes of the latest discussions between Ratch and the ULSC about the future structure and operations of the CEF (‘Version 3’) were discussed. • Building on the structure outlined in the minutes of the April 19 meeting, the following changes have been agreed in principle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Commissioning Milestone is to be the date the Certificate of Practical Completion is issued to the EPC Contractor. – Council are to form the s355 Committee as the Commissioning Milestone approaches – Council will advertise for Local Projects to apply for funds during a period agreed with CWF in the lead up to the Commissioning Milestone – The s355 Committee will receive those applications and make a report to CWF and a recommendation to Council. – Council then approves those funding recommendations, and gives CWF a Council Funding Notification. – CWF then makes the Monetary Contribution to 		

	<p>Council within 20 business days of receiving that notification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The money then gets disbursed by Council to the Approved Local Projects. CWF has satisfied its obligation to pay the Monetary Contribution in the year that follows the Commissioning Milestone. – In the second year, the s355 Committee will set its own timetable for assessing local projects and recommending them to Council. – CWF will get the Council Funding Notification, pay and thus satisfy the obligation to pay the Monetary Contribution in the second year and so on. – The Monetary Contribution will increase for inflation on the anniversary of the Commissioning Milestone. – The Collector Fund is explicitly recognised as entitled to part of the Monetary Contribution (see below). – The Collector Fund may apply for funding for its Local Projects (e.g. a scholarship fund, or a new swing set in the park), or the Council may just grant funding – this is the ‘sweep’, but it is noted that it is Council which decided whether to sweep excess funds to the Collector Fund. • The annual community fund from CWF is confirmed to be a nominal total of \$240k split as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – \$200k consistent with the obligations under the development approval for the project; agreed in principle with ULSC (v3) that it would be split 80:20 (\$160k:\$40k) in year 1 between ‘Council Fund’ and the ‘Collector Fund’, and 90:10 (\$180k:\$10k) in all subsequent years – \$40k annual contribution direct from CWF to the ‘Collector Fund’ • Although this proposed structure is agreed between Ratch and ULSC , the overall mandate of the Collector Fund remains to be explored in much more detail, with wider engagement with the broader community around the wind farm project, to ensure that its purpose, mandate and management is reflective of the wishes and preferences of that broader community. • It is anticipated that this can be done over time while the capital base is built up within the fund before any redemptions from generated income. • A number of participants in the meeting indicated 		<p>ASAP</p>
--	--	--	-------------

	<p>they had not had the opportunity to review version 3 in detail, and they had a number of specific questions they wished to see explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These included aspects of the treatment of GST in the proposed arrangements; the implications of inflation and CPI on the available funds; finalising the purposes for which the Collector Fund could be used; and the fact that an earlier reference to an education fund which had been of appeal to the Council isn't evident in the current proposal. • It was agreed that Committee Members would submit issues to Ratch, who would summarise them and advise them back to the Committee for their information. Ratch will then hold further discussions with ULSC. • It was noted that the Council will also have a 28 day public consultation process given the proposed role of a 355 Committee in managing the fund in the future. • J McK raised the need to finalise the geographic definition informing who will be eligible to apply for funds under the proposed structure. In general terms, it was agreed the definition would be based around the Council's existing procedures. • J McK also raised whether residents who come from geographic areas that would be encompassed in that overall definition of eligibility to apply, but who may not be residents of the ULSC would be eligible to be members of the proposed 355 Committee. 	<p>Committee Members</p> <p>TM</p> <p>JB</p>	<p>ASAP</p>
6	<p>Other business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting finished at 8:06 PM. 		
7	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting will potentially occur once final detailed discussions on the fund structure have been held by Ratch and ULSC, and there is in principle agreement on the entire process.</p> <p>The public consultation process would be a key focus of the meeting, taking account of the Council's 28 day process.</p>	<p>NW to determine</p>	

Meeting action items endorsed by:

Signature:

Name: Greg Smith, Independent Chair – KJA

Date: