

UPPER HUNTER ENERGY PARK

Community Consultative Committee Meeting Minutes

1. Meeting Details

Meeting #2 (under the new proponent, Maven Renewable Energy)

Date: 30 June 2026

Time: 12:38 pm – 2:30 pm

Location: Scone RSL Club, Scone NSW

Chairperson: Michael Ulph

2. Attendance

2.1 Present

Michael Ulph (Chair) (MU)

Tanja Ghahraman (Proponent) (TG)

Judith Wheeler (Member) (JW)

Peter Hale (Member) (PH) – until approximately 2pm.

Ian Brooks (Member) (IB)

Neville Cameron (Member) (NC)

Lori McKern (Member) (LM)

De-Anne Douglas (Wanaruah LALC) (DD)

Mat Pringle (Upper Hunter Shire Council) (MP)

2.2 Apologies

Yannick Zapf (Proponent)

Cr. Tayah Clout (Upper Hunter Shire Council)

Keith Murray (Scone Chamber of Commerce and Industry)

3. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair opened the meeting and provided an Acknowledgement of Country.

Members introduced themselves and their connections/interest in the project.

The Chair advised that three recording methods were being trialled to support accurate minute-taking, being the usual audio recording and two different Ai transcription tools.

4. Declarations of Interest

The Chair called for any new declarations of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests.

No new conflicts of interest were declared.

Related discussion – Crown land and paper roads

Question DD – Are any of the powerlines going through Crown land? Answer TG – Not to current knowledge.

Comment JW – Noted historical paper roads on Mountain Station that the previous proponent had arranged to purchase.

Response TG – Confirmed that paper roads on Mountain Station have long been acquired by the landholder and form part of the project area. Additional paper roads are located in the section coming down the hill (western slope), some of which are Crown roads currently understood to be under lease to the landholder.

Comment DD – Wanaruah LALC would have claims over Crown land in the area.

Action: TG to confirm status of Crown roads / paper roads and any current lease arrangements so that potential claims can be assessed.

5. Correspondence

The Chair noted no formal correspondence was received.

Draft agenda and previous meeting minutes were circulated prior to the meeting.

Meeting requests were sent to CCC members.

An attendee (EOI) list has been forwarded to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI).

Formal appointment letters to CCC members from DPHI are pending.

6. Actions from Previous Meeting

Project Website Review

TG advised the project website has been reviewed and updated, with required documents from the Major Projects website now accessible via the "Get Involved" section under "Resources and Documentation". Documents have been bundled for easier navigation. A dedicated overview slide was presented later in the meeting (see Section 7).

Consent Requirements Document (provided by JW)

TG advised the document shared by JW has been reviewed and cross-referenced against the project's planning documents. All requirements are on the project's radar, with some already met and others in progress with DPHI.

Comment JW – requested that progress against the consent requirements be tracked and reviewed at future meetings.

7. Project Presentation (TG)

General Project Update

- The Review of Environmental Factors for the 66 kV overhead line has been approved by Ausgrid and published on both the project website and the Ausgrid website.
- Grid connection contracts with Ausgrid have been fully executed — a major project milestone.
- 30% civil design is progressing, (e.g. access roads, hard stands for turbines) with refinement focused on minimising vegetation impacts. No change to turbine or access track locations from the layout previously presented.
- Transport route planning continues in close coordination with the turbine supplier, transport contractors, EnergyCo, and the Port of Newcastle.

Question JW – Will rock anchors be used for the hardstands as I am concerned about them failing in such a windy area – it was discussed by the previous proponent? Answer TG – This has not been raised during design discussions. Answer MU - A construction expert can be invited to present at a future meeting once the design is more advanced.

Question JW – Will an on-site batching plant be used for concrete? Answer TG – This option is being considered.

Question MU – When will a civil contractor be appointed, as that contractor would probably be involved in the construction methodology? Answer TG – Contractor engagement is expected once approvals and financial investment decisions are progressed later this year.

Question DD – Which part of EnergyCo is the project coordinating with, because each part may not be speaking with others? Answer TG – The project engages with multiple groups within EnergyCo, primarily in relation to the shared transport route (through Denman and Muswellbrook Shire).

Question MU – Is the UHEP just outside the REZ? Answer TG – we are now, apart from one turbine, inside the REZ (Hunter Central Coast REZ).

Question DD – Is Muswellbrook Shire Council engaged? Answer TG – Yes, meetings have been held with Muswellbrook Shire Council.

Project Website

- TG walked members through the website structure. Required documents (approval documents, project documents, CCC meeting minutes, and 66 kV overhead line documents) are accessible under "Get Involved" → "Resources and Documentation".
- Documents have been bundled for easier navigation.

Question MP – Is there a map available showing the currently proposed 18 turbines vs. the approved 34? Answer TG – A comparison map is included in the previous meeting minutes on the website.

Comment IB / LM / MP – Recommended a clear, standalone map showing the proposed 18 turbines (distinct from the originally approved 34) be added to the website, preferably on the front page and/or under a community engagement section.

Question LM – Is a modification being submitted to formalise the reduction to 18 turbines? Answer TG – Discussions with DPHI on the revised project layout are ongoing. The project approval permits up to 34 turbines; construction of fewer turbines does not require modification. A meeting with DPHI is being arranged.

Comment JW / LM – Raised concerns that the project approval (Schedule 1, project description) references "up to 34 turbines" at "up to 3 megawatts" per turbine, and that the proposed 4.2 MW turbines exceed this. JW noted that other NSW wind farm projects have been required to lodge modifications for changes to turbine specifications. JW indicated she may seek clarification from DPHI directly. Also concerns that nothing has been put in writing.

Answer TG – The project has confirmed with planning advisors that the turbine capacity reference sits within the project description and not within the conditions of consent, and that a

modification is not required provided the overall project capacity remains within approved limits (113 MW). Discussions with DPHI on the revised layout are continuing.

Comment LM – Suggested a DPHI representative be invited to a future CCC meeting to explain the rationale on such matters. MU – Advised that a DPHI assessment officer can be requested; however, they are generally limited to CCC administrative matters rather than specific planning decisions.

Technical Studies Update

Bird and Bat Adaptive Management Plan (BBAMP)

- Draft of the BBAMP has been prepared by a qualified expert approved by DPHI and submitted to DPHI for review, in accordance with Condition 3.3 of the project approval.
- The draft has been submitted together with the first year of the Bird and Bat Utilisation Survey (BBUS); the second year of survey is being finalised.
- Monitoring has shown bird and bat activity is mainly in the well-vegetated lower valley areas, rather than along the ridgelines where turbines will be located.
- The BBAMP provides for ongoing monitoring during operation (including carcass monitoring for bird strike) and sets out mitigation measures should an increase in bird strike be identified.
- DPHI feedback on the plan is pending.

Comment JW – Advised that a local resident (Andrew McPhee) has photographs of Wedge-tailed Eagles nesting on Mountain Station. JW to encourage him to share his records with TG.

Comment DD – Confirmed that the Wedge-tailed Eagle is the totem of the Wanaruah people and is culturally significant. Requested further engagement with the Wanaruah LALC on this matter and noted this will be a key concern for the Aboriginal community.

Question LM – Will the species list from the BBUS surveys be published? Answer TG – The plan will be finalised following DPHI review and made available on the project website.

Comment JW/DD – Noted concern that ecological consultants often do not consult with the local community, who have long-term observations of species presence, behaviour and significance.

Comment LM – Queried whether the DCCEE (Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water) is involved in the review of the BBAMP. TG – The department (referred to during the meeting as CPHR) has been involved in developing the survey methodology; DPHI is the approving authority.

Independent Fauna Assessment

- An independent fauna assessment has been undertaken by Anderson Environment & Planning to consider potential project impacts on fauna at Mountain Station.
- The assessment included on-site monitoring across a three-month period, using a range of standard survey methods.
- Findings indicate no significant project impacts on threatened fauna species listed under State or Commonwealth legislation.

- The assessment forms one component of the broader environmental assessment work informing further studies, the management plan, and the approval process.

Question JW – Who is currently responsible for managing feral animals on the site? Answer TG – Currently the landholder, as the project does not own the land. TG to confirm the point at which responsibility transfers to the proponent.

Comment LM – Confirmed all landholders have a general biosecurity duty. Local Land Services also undertakes proactive pest animal control including aerial shoots and ground control in conjunction with landholders.

Comment JW – Noted the BBAMP also references pest control.

Discussion – Members discussed the potential impact of turbines on aerial shooting operations.

Action: TG to review how other operating wind farms manage pest control alongside turbine operations.

Comment LM – Noted the value of community input alongside expert ecological assessments, referencing local observations of Wedge-tailed Eagle activity.

Comment DD – Raised broader observations on legless lizard records across projects in the region.

Project Plans and Programs

Compliance Tracking Program

- The Compliance Tracking Program has been prepared in accordance with Condition 4.1 of the project approval.
- Prepared by the project's Environmental Representative, formally approved by DPHI in accordance with Condition 6.1.
- The Environmental Representative will continue to monitor project delivery to ensure conditions of approval are met.
- The program includes a register of actions supporting compliance throughout the project.

Community Information Plan (CIP)

- The CIP is being finalised for submission to DPHI for approval.
- The plan sets out how the project will communicate with the community during construction and operation.
- CCC Members were invited to provide feedback on preferred communication channels, frequency of updates, and accessibility of website content.

Discussion: Members provided extensive input on community engagement approaches, including:

- Support for a community drop-in / pop-up session, with St Luke's Hall (Scone) suggested as a suitable venue.

- Recommendation to hold sessions across different times (e.g. daytime and evening) to accommodate shift workers.
- Discussion of Facebook community groups as a potential channel. TG noted expert advice against a project-run Facebook page but agreed to consider approaching community group administrators to post project updates.
- Comment from DD on the value of joint community meetings held for other projects in the region (McCullys Gap area), which enabled community members to view all projects at one venue.

Question IB – Has the Community Information Plan been finalised? Answer TG – In the process of finalising. Further input from CCC members is welcomed.

Comment JW – Requested improved website navigation, noting that important documents currently sit under "Get Involved" and are not easily discoverable. Answer TG – will look into a dedicated page for important documents.

Comment LM – Suggested CCC meeting minutes and updates be added under the dedicated CCC heading, in addition to (or instead of) the current "Resources and Documentation" location. Answer TG – noted for action.

8. General Business

Local Business Engagement

Question IB – What is being done to engage local businesses for project construction? Answer TG – A business registration channel is available on the project website. Interested businesses have registered and construction companies are being connected accordingly. Further information on local procurement opportunities will be included in future community communications.

Updated Photomontages

Question IB – Have the photomontages been updated as discussed at the previous meeting? Answer TG – Updated photomontages have been prepared, comparing the approved layout with the proposed layout, including new photos and replicated viewpoints where appropriate. These will be presented at the next CCC meeting.

End-of-Life / Decommissioning

Question IB – What is the plan and funding mechanism for end-of-life decommissioning of the wind farm? Answer TG – Decommissioning requirements are addressed in the conditions of consent, including removal of above-ground infrastructure. TG to provide further detail on the decommissioning plan and funding arrangements.

Comment JW – Noted that older consents do not typically include a decommissioning funding requirement, unlike more recent consents.

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

Question DD – What archaeological site work has been undertaken for the project? Answer TG – Umwelt has been engaged as the archaeological consultant, with work undertaken for the powerline REF in 2023–24 and updated in 2025. DD requested further engagement to review scope and outcomes.

Aboriginal Business Procurement

Comment DD – Advised that Aboriginal business procurement should be verified through the Wanaruah LALC to ensure engagement of genuine local Aboriginal-owned businesses. DD offered to provide capability statements from local Aboriginal businesses. TG to engage with DD on Aboriginal procurement pathways.

Financial Close

Question JW – Has financial close been reached? Answer TG – Not yet. Discussions with power purchase agreement counterparties are ongoing.

Community Enquiries

Comment JW – Advised she has received a number of phone calls from community members seeking information about the project. In each case, she has directed them to the project website and to TG for direct enquiries.

All Other Business

No further items were raised by NC, LM, MP or TG.

9. Next Meeting

- Proposed date: Tuesday, 15 September 2026.
- A site inspection was discussed and agreed to be deferred until access tracks have been established for safe vehicle access.

10. Actions

#	Action	Responsibility	Due Date
1	Confirm status of Crown roads / paper roads on Mountain Station (including any current lease arrangements) so that potential Wanaruah LALC claims can be assessed.	Proponent	Next meeting
2	Confirm which department(s) are formally responsible for reviewing and approving elements of the BBAMP.	Proponent	Next meeting
3	Confirm point at which responsibility for feral animal control transfers from landholder to proponent.	Proponent	Next meeting
4	CCC members to review project website and provide suggestions on improvements to content and navigation.	CCC Members	Next meeting
5	Investigate feasibility of inviting a DPHI assessment officer to a future CCC meeting.	Chair	Next meeting
6	DD requested further engagement with the Wanaruah LALC regarding Wedge-tailed Eagle as the totem of the Wanaruah people.	Proponent	When appropriate
7	Review how other operating wind farms manage pest control alongside turbine operations.	Proponent	Next meeting

Appendix A – Updated Presentation

(Attendees and apologies updated only)



Upper Hunter Energy Park

Community Consultative Committee

30 June 2026

Agenda



Welcome &
Acknowledgement of Country



Apologies



New Declaration of Interest



Correspondence



Actions from Previous Meeting



General Project Update



Project Website Update



Technical Studies Update



Project Plans & Programs



General Business



Next meeting



Welcome & Acknowledgement of Country

Community Consultation Committee Members

In Attendance

- Michael Ulph (CCC Chairperson)
- Tanja Ghahraman (UHEP)
- Judith Wheeler (Member)
- Peter Hale (Member)
- Ian Brooks (Member)
- Neville Cameron (Member)
- Lori McKern (Member)
- De-Anne Douglas (Wanaruah Local Aboriginal Land Council)
- Mat Pringle (Upper Hunter Shire Council)

Apologies

- Yannick Zapf (UHEP)
- Cr. Tayah Clout (Upper Hunter Shire Council)
- Keith Murray (Scone Chamber of Commerce & Industry)

New Declaration of Interest

Correspondence

Correspondence



Minutes



Meeting requests



Completed EOI, CoC and Declaration of Interests documents



Acknowledgement from DPHI regarding forms submitted

Actions from Previous Meeting

Actions for the previous meeting – 2 April 2026



Project website review and update



Consent requirements document (JW)

General Project Update

General project update



66kV Overhead Line: Ausgrid determination of Environmental Factors published on the UHEP and Ausgrid websites



Grid Connection secured: Ausgrid and UHEP have executed the grid connection agreements



Progressing 30% civil design: Refining access tracks and turbine pads to optimise the project layout and minimise environmental impact



Transport route planning advancing: Transport route planning is well progressed, with final route assessment completed and landowner discussions underway



Coordination with EnergyCo on shared transport corridors: Working with EnergyCo to coordinate shared transport corridors and minimise community impact during construction



Logistics coordination with the Port of Newcastle: Logistics planning progressed with the Port of Newcastle for turbine component handling



Project Website Update

UHEP Website

On the “Get Involved” page

Resources and Documentation

Statutory Approvals	–
NSW Project Approval – 06_0055	
Assessment Documentation	–
Assessment on the NSW Major Projects Site	
Environmental Assessment – Sections	
Environmental Assessment – Appendices – Ecological Site Assessment & Referral	
Environmental Assessment – Appendices – Visual Assessment	
Environmental Assessment – Appendices – Other	
Response to Submission	
Community Engagement	–
Information Sheet – February-2025	
CCC Meeting Minutes	–
UHEP CCC Meeting – Minutes & Presentation – 2 April 2026	
66kV Overhead Line	–
UHEP 66kV Power Line – Final REF – 13 March 2026	
UHEP REF Determination Report – Approval – 13 April 2026	
UHEP 66kV Power Line – Published on Ausgrid Website	

Technical Studies Update

Bird and Bat Adaptive Management Plan (BBAMP)



BBAMP Draft submitted to the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) for review in accordance with Condition 3.3. We are awaiting DPHI's response.



Prepared by an approved qualified expert: Prepared by Australian Ecology Solutions (AES), formally approved by DPHI, again in accordance with Condition 3.3



1st Year of Bird and Bat Utilisation Surveys (BBUS) completed: first year of seasonal bird and bat surveys across 10 sites established pre-construction baseline conditions.



Bird activity: 62 species recorded, with most activity in valleys rather than ridgelines where turbines are located.



Bat activity: 14 species recorded, with the highest activity in well-vegetated lower areas rather than turbine locations.



Risk outlook: Most species are assessed as low or negligible risk, with only a small number identified as moderate risk.



Adaptive management approach: Monitoring, impact triggers and mitigation measures are in place to manage any impacts during operation.

Independent Fauna Assessment



Final report received from Anderson Environment & Planning (AEP), an independent ecological consultancy engaged to assess fauna impacts associated with the proposed project footprint.



Targeted field surveys completed across the project area, including habitat assessments and species-specific surveys for threatened fauna with potential to occur on site.



Fauna findings: No significant project impacts identified for threatened fauna species listed under State or Commonwealth legislation.



Habitat outcomes: The revised project layout avoids key fauna habitat features, with impacts limited to areas of lower ecological value.



Next steps: Findings will inform the project's ongoing environmental management and approval processes.

Project Plans & Programs

Compliance Tracking Program

Compliance Tracking Program finalised in accordance with Condition 4.1 of the project approval.



Prepared by an approved environmental specialist: Prepared by Across Environmental, formally approved by DPHI as the project's Environmental Representative in accordance with Condition 6.1.



Purpose: Sets out how the project will track, review and report on compliance with all conditions of approval throughout construction and operation.



Includes: Processes for compliance review, independent auditing, non-compliance rectification, and incident recording and reporting.



Available to DPHI on request: The program is maintained as a project document and will be made available to DPHI upon request, in line with the conditions of approval.



Ongoing management: The program will be reviewed and updated regularly to reflect project progress and any changes to project requirements.

Community Information Plan (CIP)



Purpose of the CIP: Sets out how the project will provide clear, timely and ongoing information to the community throughout construction and operation.



What the CIP covers: Communication channels, notification processes, complaints management, and stakeholder engagement approach.



Approach: Focus on transparency, accessibility, and responsiveness to community feedback

CCC Input – areas for discussion



Preferred communication channels: Is a proposed mix of website, newsletters and direct email updates (where address available) appropriate?



Frequency of updates: Is a proposed approach of regular updates, with additional notifications for key activities, suitable?



Accessibility of information: The project will provide clear and accessible information through the project website. Does the CCC have any suggestions to improve the clarity of website content or layout?

General Business

Next Meeting

Next meeting



Date proposed: Tuesday, September 15, 2026



Site inspection to be considered

Our goal is the generation of electricity from renewable, clean, and sustainable sources.

Making a valuable contribution to our communities and the future of electricity generation as a model for sustainable development lies at the heart of UHEP.

We look forward to achieving our objectives collaboratively with the members of the Community Consultative Committee.