



<b>Project:</b>	<b>Coopers Gap Wind Farm</b>
<b>Meeting No:</b>	8
<b>Date:</b>	Thursday 17 January 2013
<b>Venue and Time:</b>	Kingaroy Town Community Common Hall
<b>Document:</b>	Meeting notes and actions
<b>Chair/Facilitator:</b>	Kath Elliott, (KE), GHD
<b>Minutes:</b>	Rosa Han (RH), AGL
<b>AGL representatives:</b>	Evan Carless (EC) Project Manager Amanda Shaw (AS) Community Engagement Manager
<b>Committee Members:</b>	Ian Schafferius, Participating landowner
	Sue Sinnamon, Participating landowner
	Tom Hoare, Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters
	Cyril Stewart, Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters
	Jane Holdsworth, Western Downs Regional Council
	Chris Du Plessis, South Burnett Regional Council
	Neil French, Neighbour
	Mick Cosgrove, Neighbour
	Councillor Tony Brame, Economic Development and Tourism for WDRC
	Gregory Taffe, Kingaroy Chamber of Commerce
<b>Apologies:</b>	Mal Collinge, Local Aboriginal Elder
<b>Community observers in attendance:</b>	Approximately 8

- > Being Australia's largest private owner and operator of renewable energy assets
- > Gaining accreditation under the National GreenPower Accreditation Program for AGL Green Energy®, AGL Green Living® and AGL Green Spirit
- > Being selected as a constituent of the FTSE4Good Index Series

## Meeting Minutes

Item	Action
<p><b>1. Welcome</b></p> <p>Kath Elliott (KE) welcomed the CCC members and observers in attendance and introduced the four new members of the CCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greg Taffe</li> <li>• Tony Brame</li> <li>• Mick Cosgrove</li> <li>• Neil French</li> </ul> <p>AS discussed logistics for the CCC going forward. She explained that KE was no longer working for GHD however to ensure consistency, AGL has engaged KE directly in the short-term. AS stated that there was an opportunity to engage a more local facilitator for the committee in the longer-term. AS asked the committee to please let her know if they had any recommendations for a more local facilitator.</p> <p>KE discussed the agenda with the committee and explained the purpose of this meeting was to discuss what topics the committee would like to address at future meetings and how the committee wanted to be engaged going forward.</p> <p>The minutes from the November 2012 meeting were discussed and adopted with no changes required.</p>	
<p><b>2. Overview of project status, Evan Carless (EC)</b></p> <p>EC gave an overview of the project status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial Environment Assessment Report was submitted in March 2011</li> <li>• AGL is currently preparing the Revised Assessment Report which will be released in the coming months</li> <li>• The Revised Assessment Report is an opportunity for the government agencies and members of the community to make another round of submissions</li> <li>• Following this, the Final Revised Assessment Report will be prepared by AGL and an application submitted to the State Government for determination</li> <li>• The application will then be with the State Government to make a decision</li> </ul>	

- If approved, AGL will make an investment decision based on market conditions, current power prices and forecasted future power prices
- Currently, there is a review of the Renewable Energy Target (RET). The Federal Government will make a decision on this
- If AGL makes an investment decision to proceed with the project, the next stage is the process of awarding the construction contract
- Construction would then start 3-6 months after the investment decision
- Typically, it takes approximately 3 years from when the construction contract is awarded to when the wind farm is fully constructed. The turbines would then come into operation progressively during the later stages of construction

*Questions from committee members:*

Q1. What happened to the submissions made by the local Councils?

A1. EC advised that in April 2011, both Councils made a submission in response to the Initial Assessment Report. These submissions are all being considered by AGL and the environmental consultants AECOM and will be addressed in the revised environmental assessment.

Q2. Before the Initial Assessment Report there was a meeting with State Government representatives. It was noted that this was an effective forum. Will you host a similar meeting before releasing the Revised Assessment Report?

A2. EC stated he will speak to the environmental consultants (AECOM) and get their advice on this matter.

Q3. What will the timeframes be if everything is going to plan?

A3. EC noted there is no statutory timeframe for when the State Government must make their decision. The advice from AECOM is that it normally takes between 6-12 months from when the application is submitted. If a favourable decision is made within approximately 12 months, the timeframe could look like the following:

- Mid 2014 – approved by State Government
- Mid 2014 – start tender process for construction contract
- End of 2014 – AGL to make investment decision
- Beginning 2015 – contract to construction
- End of 2017 – project is finalised

EC noted there is a high level of confidence with the construction timeframe which is approximately 3 years from awarding the contract to completion. On the other hand, the 2 main uncertainties with the timeframe include:

1. Government's decision
2. AGL making an investment decision

Q4. How many other wind farm developments do AGL currently have?

A4. EC stated that AGL has a large portfolio in wind and after the Macarthur Wind Farm in VIC, the next project in the pipeline is the Silverton Wind Farm in NSW. EC noted the main difference between Coopers Gap and Silverton was that Silverton already had the planning approval whereas Coopers Gap is in the planning phase.

EC noted there are also a number of other potential wind farm projects that are also in the pipeline but are not as advanced as Coopers Gap.

AS added that AGL also has the Solar Flagships project which is currently proposed for Broken Hill and Nyngan.

Questions from observers:

Q1. What's the likelihood of the output of this wind farm increasing or decreasing?

A1. EC stated that due to the current stage of the project, there is a high probability that the shape of the wind farm may change to some degree however this was yet to be confirmed. EC noted that it was hard to confirm at this stage whether the output would be increasing or decreasing. He noted at this stage, AGL were currently taking into consideration the site, what types of turbines could be used, as well as environmental and community issues.

<p>Q2. Is there a target output you're looking at?</p> <p>A2. EC stated there is no specific target output with this wind farm and instead the focus is to look at utilising a good wind resource in close proximity to a transmission line. Also, he noted the planning submission won't detail the output level and instead will focus on the range available.</p>	
<p><b>3. Reflection and look ahead, Amanda Shaw (AS)</b></p> <p>KE stated that with the new year and the four new members, this was a good opportunity to pause and reflect on what the committee had achieved and how it would like to operate in the future.</p> <p>AS noted that at the first CCC meeting, the committee members at the time decided on what topics they wanted to discuss at future meetings and now was a good time to receive feedback from the committee and identify any other topics the committee would like to discuss.</p> <p>KE noted that at the previous meeting, a member mentioned that the committee had heard a lot of presentations and felt there should be more discussion amongst the committee. KE stated this was a good opportunity to identify what the committee would like to achieve and asked the committee if they would like to continue with the presentations or something different.</p> <p>A member noted that the committee had changed over time and they believed some of the topics on the initial list weren't as important now as they were in the past.</p> <p>It was agreed the topics the committee would like to discuss in the next 2-3 months were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property values (including a discussion around the financial aspect or borrowing against) – with a presentation from a real estate agent or other professional in this area</li> <li>• High level discussion about traffic</li> <li>• Benefits to community and business and how AGL can best engage with local business</li> </ul> <p>A member asked if there would be a visit to an operating wind farm. EC stated this would depend on the level of interest from the committee and this would be discussed in more detail at a future meeting.</p> <p>In regards to traffic, it was discussed that a detailed discussion about traffic would be held once the construction contract was awarded however over the next few months, a more high level discussion could be held to look at the approximate number of movements on the road and the potential routes planned to be taken.</p>	

A member stated once the committee had the opportunity to view the Revised Assessment Report, there would be more questions that would arise from this. The member also stated the past presentations have been useful and the committee now has a higher technical knowledge than when they first joined the committee.

Q1. Will workers be sourced locally or will they be fly-in fly-out?

EC noted that with AGL's other projects to date, a significant proportion of the workforce was sourced locally as this was seen by the construction contractor as the most efficient way to deliver the project. He noted it was likely this approach would also be adopted by the construction contractor for this project.

EC added resources for specialist positions are often found more widely and are brought in as required. However in these instances, they are accommodated in the local area and not in a construction camp. This is the planned method for this project as well.

One member noted that he considered the wind farm was beneficial for some farms as it drought-proofed their farms however for the direct neighbours who are down wind and impacted by noise, they should get money as well. In response, one committee member mentioned that it was important all new members understood what had been learnt about the wind farm and noise at earlier meetings.

AS suggested the new members read the noise material addressed at earlier meetings and she was happy to discuss this further with the members outside this meeting.

#### 4. Council submissions

KE noted submissions were made in April 2011 by both Western Downs Regional Council (WDRC) and South Burnett Regional Council (SBRC). Jane Holdsworth (WDRC) and Chris Du Plessis (SBRC) will present the key topics raised and discuss further.

WDRC – Jane Holdsworth (JH) presented.

Key topics:

- Community engagement – utilising local businesses
- Socio-economic assessment – looking at affordable housing/accommodation for the contractors
- Community fund – focusing more on the region and looking at how council can manage this
- Cultural heritage – engaging with aboriginal owners
- Land use and planning
- Landscape and visual – this should fit in with the local community and could potentially be a tourist attraction
- Noise – this was a critical factor at the time the submission was made and still needs some work
- Transport – critical topic that needs to be discussed in more detail
- Aviation – safety risks to be considered and would need to discuss installing lights
- Electromagnetic interference – currently being discussed by the committee
- Flora and fauna – concerns about bats in the area and how the turbines can affect the bio system
- Health – this topic has already been discussed

EC noted that these council submissions have been reviewed to determine the key issues and these issues are being addressed in the Revised Assessment Report.

JH noted that she now had an increased understanding of some of the key issues since participating in the CCC.

SBRC – Chris Du Plessis (CD)

CD noted that the submission was done in April 2011 and since then, many topics had been discussed at the CCC's.

- Legislative framework – high level issues of rural and production zones and felt the report didn't sufficiently address these issues
- Land use planning – some legislations and policies weren't included
- Noise – potential impact on livestock and health will always be an issue
- Shadow flicker –
- Visual amenity – this will always be an issue to those who don't like the turbines
- Support local employment
- Access in traffic – impact on the road network as discussed earlier and the construction traffic impact on the community and farming operations
- Community fund – would like to see a committee and board established to manage the distribution of the fund
- Siting of turbines – the location will be driven by noise guidelines if the State Government releases this
- Health – there was concern with this topic as there is not a lot of reliable information available

CD concluded that many of the issues had been addressed through the CCC's and the next step was to review the Revised Assessment Report.

EC confirmed the Revised Assessment Report will be available in the next few months.

Questions:

Q1. With regards to the visual aspect of the turbines, can other colours be proposed?

A1. EC commented that the colour used has been identified as the average colour of the sky and this assisted in camouflaging the turbines into the sky.

One committee member commented that it was important that the turbines were placed in an area which had the best wind resource. Then the next steps should be to look at how close the proposed turbine location was to properties.



<p>Q2. Will there be continued monitoring?</p> <p>A2. Once the wind farm is commissioned, compliance monitoring would commence which would be dictated by the planning approval. There will be a section in the Revised Assessment Report which outlines this monitoring further.</p> <p>AS also provided an example of extensive noise monitoring being conducted at the Macarthur Wind Farm. This is beyond what is required from the Planning Permit and was in place before the wind farm was operational. Once fully operational, compliance monitoring will commence.</p>	
<p><b>5. Update on the status of the revised environmental assessment report AGL plan to submit, EC</b></p> <p>See presentation slide 9.</p> <p>No questions raised.</p>	
<p><b>6. Results of community poll, AS</b></p> <p>AS discussed the community poll that was conducted in December 2012. This poll was conducted by QDos, a social research company. The report is currently being finalised and a summary of the findings will be presented to the CCC.</p> <p>See Presentation slide 10 – 19</p> <p>AS asked the CCC what they thought of the findings.</p> <p>A number of CCC representatives advised that they thought this was a good news story that should be published in the paper. AS confirmed the final report will be available on the website and distributed with the meeting minutes (if not before.)</p> <p><i>Post meeting minute: The percentage of local respondents that believed the Coopers Gap Wind Farm would have a negative impact on local jobs was wrongly reported at the meeting (slide 15). 18% was reported however the correct figure is 8%. This presentation slide has now been updated to reflect the correct percentage.</i></p>	

**7. Close and other business**

It was agreed that the next meeting will be held at Bell Community Centre from 1pm to 4pm on Thursday, 21 February 2013.

It was again agreed that the following topics will be discussed during the next 2-3 meetings:

- Property values (including a discussion around the financial aspect or borrowing against) – with a presentation from a real estate agent or other professional in this area
- High level discussion about traffic
- Benefits to community and business and how AGL can best engage with local business

AGL noted that the availability of guest speakers would determine which of the above topics would be discussed at the next meeting.

Any other business:

There was discussion amongst the CCC members on how they could provide more information to the community. The following was suggested:

- Letter box drops
- Newsletters
- Advertorials (most preferred channel of communication as identified in the community poll)
- Updates on shopping centre noticeboards
- Providing a 1-2 page summary of the CCC meeting to media outlets. This summary would need to be distributed to the CCC for comment before being released to media outlets.

A member suggested the community poll results should be used as a positive media story.

A member suggested a press release should be developed introducing the new members and how the committee is advancing and evolving. The new members provided their consent for their names to be on the website.

One committee member enquired about Mal Collinge as he had not been present at recent meetings. AS noted she had spoken to Mal since the previous meeting and during this discussion Mal had expressed his apologies for not being able to attend recent meetings due to time constraints. AS noted Mal has expressed his interest in continuing to participate in the CCC. AS noted she suggested to Mal that he considered nominating an alternate person to attend on his behalf when he was not available.

AS to discuss suggestion with AGL media team

AS to discuss suggestion with AGL media team

