



Project	Gloucester Coal Seam Gas Project	From	Michael Ulph
Subject	Community Consultative Committee	Tel	4941 2841
Venue/Date/Time	Friday June 17 th 2011 Gloucester Country Club, 10am – 3pm	Job No	21/17714
Copies to	All attendees		
Attendees	Ian Shaw – AGL Lands Officer Clr Richard Webb – Gloucester Shire Council Rod Williams – Community Representative Marnie Johnson – The Gloucester Project Garry Smith – Barrington, Gloucester, Stroud Preservation Alliance Lisa Anderson – Mid Coast Water David Mitchell – Avon Valley Landcare Naomi Rowe – AGL Community Relations Manager Mark Bonisch – AGL – Operations Manager Michael Ulph – GHD (Facilitator) Lilen Pautasso – GHD (Assistant Facilitator)	Apologies	Sally Whitelaw Karen Hutchinson Tim Hickman Ed Robinson Anna Kaliska Paul Hogan Toni Laurie

1. Introductions

Action

Michael Ulph

Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country

Committee was advised the main objective was to discuss and contribute to the stakeholder engagement plan currently under development.

2. Meeting discussion

– Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), CCC structure, impactful activity,

Naomi Rowe

AGL would like to gather feedback to further develop the SEP so that feedback is fed into the document for the project. There is a need for clarity and information for the community. We need to find ways to meet those needs.



3. CCC Structure

Marnie: the CCC was voluntarily assembled by AGL. Is the CCC going to be a regulatory CCC that comes under the terms and conditions of AGL?

Naomi: there is no formalisation from the minister, but the nominees go forward and appoint a Chair and people for the panel. That's not contained for the conditions of approval for the project- however we will continue that forum. If we need it to be formalised by the Minister we can pursue that.

Marnie: I have a concern that if it's not legislative – from a community point of view we need a guarantee that our views are being used. I would like to table this for consideration. There needs to be a mechanism for what action is going to occur and will then impact the community.

Naomi: This will be our first action of the meeting. The sentiment from AGL is to have something more robust so that there is an action-focussed meeting.

Richard: the suggestion in the consent is that there be an SEP in order to try and resolve the issues that have been and quite rightfully raised. In my experience with CCC's, the ones that have been pertinent to us is that their make-up hasn't satisfied requirements, So it seems that what the regulators have tried to do recognise that the CCC's recognise what it has to do by putting to back into the community. They give us a platform for community input. I think that the importance of the SEP is that it needs to work and needs to satisfy the community's desires. We've all seen shortcoming so we want something formal in place.

Marnie: there will be times where there are differences of opinion so there need to be safeguards put into place in order to cement its status.

Ian: In previous instances there were groups invited and there were community representatives. This group can decide with the assistance of the company on how this is going to work.

Michael: Going further it will be taken back to the community as a way to get more input and to call for further feedback.

Marnie: It would be good for there to be greater input from the community. There should be an opportunity for further input. It's good to have these meetings but we all have our prejudices, but if we have a community forum – whether one person attends or 100 – they have the opportunity to provide their views.

Richard: won't the SEP put forward the ideas of the CCC and other stakeholders?

Naomi: Yes. Other interests would be sought.

Richard: that's good, the community input would also be most important.

Naomi: So the action today will be to put out a proposal to seek further

Naomi agreed to develop these views further so that AGL can use the principles discussed to form a value-set and a formal structure. These principles will allow the CCC to be aware of their influence and what they can/cannot make decisions about. CCC and Naomi to develop the idea of publicising the CCC membership through Michael Ulph to allow the community to have contact with them.



community input following discussion with the CCC.

Marnie: I think it's good to see what comes out of the forum today, but I don't necessarily represent the views of the community so more input from those that are affected would be important.

Michael: the SEP is all about how we're informing the community about the project. It's assumed that the project is going ahead and the consultation process is all about informing, engaging and answering questions from the community.

Gary: Yes, but there's no assessment of improvement in the SEP, and that's my issue.

Naomi: OK, so in order to keep the conversation going we will take your concern and formalise it as an objective to seek meaningful improvement from this process.

Michael: discussed a community forum from a different project and how the communication with affected landholders and the community is quite affective through a forum.

David: People want forums where they can ask questions, however the comments I get from people I speak with there are some who really want the project (jobs) while others don't want it – you can't get them to meet halfway. The forums are tricky because it's hard to meet in the middle – it's no use people coming along who are determined to get rid of the project. People won't come along thinking all the decisions have been made. We want a forum where people can ask questions without being bullied by large companies to receive the right answers.

Gary: I think the issue of a policing role should be introduced because it is something that proves a concern in the community. I think the community will feel more comfortable attending meetings where there is a policing role that allows for transparent discussion. I strongly feel that policing be an issue for discussion.

Marnie: I see 'policing' as listening to people's concerns and having some input into the project.

Lisa: the ownership should be on AGL to make sure that everything is right and they need to be the ones to find the issues and to fix them. While I agree partly with the 'policing' I think the responsibility lies more on AGL – it's not up to the community to find the problems.

Michael: discussed what AGL should be doing to make sure they are looking for the issues and addressing them.

Marnie: I think there needs to be an independent person of the CCC that may not have a general interest.

Gary: I think it's a good idea but it might be too much of an adversary role. It should be talked about.

Naomi: Could you please explain why you [Marney] feel like the CCC members aren't right for this role? And what can AGL do to



assist our CCC members in having that role?

Marnie: the majority of us do not get to speak to people; we try and see as many people as we can. Unfortunately the reality is that we are not fairly representing the community. Some farmers don't approach us because we're too "articulate" and you also get to people who have a complaint that they want to express but are scared of authority.

Rod: but if they won't come to us, what's to say they will approach an independent member?

Marnie: It was an idea – I'm just concerned that people whinge with no information and bury themselves thinking it's too late. But here we have an opportunity to give them an avenue. It's just a concern that I wanted to raise.

Michael: I think you're looking at an integrated strategy where any stakeholder can put information forward on this and ask for responses from AGL.

Marnie: Yes, it's a real concern because there are implications in stakeholder input.

Naomi: what I'm feeling from you is that you're frustrated about this issue and AGL need to do work to address that barrier. We need to work on breaking that down.

Marnie: I think, even though some people won't turn up, that a forum needs to be set up so that everyone has an opportunity.

Naomi: So what I'm hearing is that we need to have a lot of different mechanisms.

Richard: What I feel is that we need to have a complaints process, but I feel the Stakeholder Engagement process shouldn't just be a venue for handling complaints. We need to identify who the stakeholders are first and then we can work on dealing with specific issues.

Michael: yes, and I have a plan to present today to work through that.

Rod: I think Marney has made a point, however I think we are accurately representative in this forum and that many of the issues have been handled in previous meetings.

4. Impactful Activity

Michael: OK well now I am going to write down the various impactful activities so that we can discuss this further.

Lists below developed in consultation with the CCC

Impact activity:

1. Drilling on property
 2. Central processing facility
-



-
3. Pipeline
 4. Field development
 5. Access/road development (public and private)
 6. Under bores
 7. Water management
 8. Incidents

Stakeholders relating to each of the above impactful activities:

1. Drilling:

- a. Landholders
- b. Neighbours
- c. Council
- d. Road users
- e. Regulators
- f. Broader community
- g. Local Aboriginal land Councils (L.A.L.C)
- h. Interest groups
- i. Local businesses

2. Central processing facility:

- a. Neighbours – (Richard wished to define ‘neighbours’ as “broadly encompassing” not just “next door to facility” – mutual agreement from AGL)
- b. Councils
- c. Regulators
- d. Broader community
- e. L.A.L.C.

3. Pipeline:

- a. Landholders
- b. Neighbours
- c. Council
- d. Road users
- e. Regulators
- f. Broader community
- g. L.A.L.C
- h. Interest groups
- i. Local businesses

4. Field development:

- a. Landholders
- b. Neighbours
- c. Council
- d. Road users
- e. Regulators
- f. Broader community
- g. L.A.L.C
- h. Interest groups
- i. Local businesses

5. Access/road development:

- a. Landholders
 - b. Neighbours
 - c. Council
 - d. Road users
 - e. Regulators
-



-
- f. Broader community
 - g. L.A.L.C
 - h. Interest groups
 - i. Local businesses

6. Under bores:

- a. Mid coast water/ Hunter water
- b. Catchment management
- c. Industry groups
- d. Irrigators
- e. Other regulators (e.g. fisheries)

7. Water management:

- a. Landholders
- b. Neighbours
- c. Council
- d. Road users
- e. Regulators
- f. Broader community
- g. L.A.L.C
- h. Interest groups
- i. Local businesses

8. Incidents:

- a. Statutory reporting
- b. Reporting to CCC (incidents and complaints)
- c. Reporting to the greater community
- d. See minutes below

5. Communicating with Stakeholders

Richard: is there a means by identifying who is going to be impacted?

Naomi: yes, definitely. It's called a 'zone of influence'.

Richard: OK. So they [people in that zone] should get a letter, not a notice in the paper.

Naomi: we can establish principles on what the zone of influence is. On other projects AGL have established principles rather than numbers because sometimes 5km's is not the right number.

Michael: compared landowners affected by noise on a railway line project, while living further away they are still impacted and they are therefore contacted and kept informed.

Richard: I think that's a fantastic idea.

David: In terms of the email and internet – that could be limited to people in this community. I think the communication should be fitted to this community by various means. It should be appropriate because everyone, particularly here, is different in their means of obtaining information.



Michael: Absolutely, and that's why we make the best effort to use a broad range of communication activities. There should be no exception on this project.

David: that's great.

6. Defining stakeholders

Gary: is there a hierarchy of stakeholders? Because they can't all have the same interests and be the seen as 'the same', there should an understanding of particular interests.

Naomi: Yes absolutely. The people who are most impacted get, what we would call "gold star" treatment so to speak, and those who are interested receive "gold class". We make sure we are aware of the level of interest. Stakeholders are not treated homogenously.

7. Publicising the Project

Richard: is it possible to try and put a sign up that states what is going to happen?

Naomi: AGL is required to do this, it's a condition and it's also quite standard practise on major projects such as this. If people are interested in this then they can see what is going on and they can contact the appropriate people.

David: I think that's a great idea because people are inquisitive and want to know about this. To involve the community in that stage is a great thing to do.

Mark: yes and, if we even have to do community tours to help foster that interest in the project then, within OH&S limits, we would endeavour to do that.

Michael: there are other opportunities to get the community involved such as getting schools involved and students.

8. Incidents

Michael: do we have any ideas on what types of things should be communicated to what types of stakeholders?

Mark: the reason for putting incidents up there was to see if we could develop an agenda where the incident could be discussed and addressed openly. The CCC would then have the opportunity to 'police' the issue and hold AGL accountable.

Richard: certainly I think a reporting process is a good idea and there should be a recording process to highlight the incidents or concerns. I



also think that if the CCC could take the role for being a venue for that sort of concern that would be great.

Naomi: as part of our role we have to create a complaints register. While for privacy reasons we can't attribute names, we can develop a report that highlights what the complaints were and how we addressed it and how long it took then we can discuss this with the CCC.

Richard: I think that would be fantastic for the CCC to get that opportunity so that we can have the appropriate input into the situation and we can further generate interaction with the community and with stakeholders.

Naomi: complaints are very important and we need to be responding to them and that process is already confirmed. In terms of incidents, they are beyond complaints they are a higher level.

Michael: if these items are being recorded they can be shared with the CCC to allow for this transparent process and for an integrated approach to fixing the issues that may have arisen (entire table agreed with Michael's comment).

Lisa: I think that if there is a transparent process and the community is informed of an incident that would be much more beneficial. I think being on the front foot is significantly important.

Naomi: so how can we communicate those incidents?

Naomi: if there's an incident (e.g. environmental as a more contentious issue) then it should be published on our website and a paid advertisement in the newspaper.

Rod: I think a letter is the most important thing, particularly if people are involved.

Naomi: OK. I've noted that. What I would probably do following the feedback I just received, I would contact the neighbours, the CCC, put a statement on the website and a paid advertisement in the paper.

Richard: I appreciate that, but I don't want to wait for a CCC meeting.

Naomi: No, that wouldn't occur. It would be an immediate action.

Mark: discussed the process of communicating the incident and the contingency methods that would be in place. Mark emphasised the immediacy of this process.

Marnie: from a community point of view there are real concerns (e.g. how am I affected? What's the impact?) which need to be addressed – not just informed that there has been an incident.

Michael: and that would most certainly be the questions addressed following the incident. The responses are tailored to the community concerns.



9. Impacts

Types of impacts and information

1. Timing
 - a. Delays
 - b.
2. Any impacts
 - a. Noise
 - b. Vibration
 - c. Visual (e.g. lighting)
 - d. Traffic
 - e. Incidents
 - f. Water
3. Areas (geographic)
4. After hours work
5. Major materials transport
6. Who is performing work
7. What is happening
8. Data/results (water quality etc.)
9. CCC minutes
10. Regular updates
11. Fracking materials and chemicals
12. FAQs

Michael: explained why he chose these options and offered opportunity for feedback and further contribution to the list.

David: suggested 'crowd control' due to the number of people on a property or potential crowds that could go to the site (e.g. protesters). This could impact on the safety of the property and the landowners.

Naomi: this protocol is part of our issues management process and is implemented to ensure safety of all people on site.

Mark: in terms of crowd control, if there is significant interest in seeing the project then site tours can be organised for the community.

Gary: is there a water impact and should we be considering it – for example river discharges?

Mark: at this stage no, but if it was to happen then we would notify landowners.

Gary: we should keep the community informed at all times, but not overload them with detail. Keeping in touch is important, but not overloading them with technical information all the time.

Naomi: explained the 'community updates' process and newsletters that follow this suggestion.

Richard: brought up the issue of 'light spill' where there can be excessive light during night work disturbing the surrounding areas.

Mark: explained how 'lessons learned' from other projects have meant



there are now lights that don't impact on the surrounding areas as much. They are more focussed on the area.

Richard: following that one of the issues is the cumulative impact. The negative component that AGL drew for that is that you were getting blame for the amount of equipment being used and the excessive resources, where in fact it was more than one company and project. There needs to be lines of communication between the various resource and other companies to identify which [impacts are being caused by] AGL.

Lisa: but is that going to benefit the community if the equipment says AGL on it?

Naomi: yes, absolutely because it allows the consultation team to refer enquiries on to the right people and putting them in contact with who they need to talk to.

Michael: moved on to 'ways of communicating' and opened forum for discussion.

10. Communication

Ways of communicating

1. Newsletter
2. Website
3. Presentations
4. CCC
5. Letterbox dropping
6. Individual meetings (including specific demographics)
7. Open days
8. Partnered meetings
9. Workshops
10. Site visits
11. 1800 number
12. Press advertisements
13. Signage (branded)
14. Fact sheets
15. Radio
16. Mail

Richard: there was a breakdown in communication with GRL so what I was going to suggest is that protocols could be in place so that this type of communication can occur on a more regular basis.

Michael: so like a standard update?

Richard: yes, exactly. And there should be another avenue for engaging these stakeholders.

Michael: explained the process of consulting and how they identify who needs to be contacted at different stages of the project.

Naomi: explained what 'letterbox dropping' is and how it captures the GPS logs of what stakeholders were contacted and/or consulted.



Marnie: we need to save trees! [referring to printing of newsletters etc]

Richard: I've been spoken to by one particular landowner who has never been approached so, it's important that everyone that is impacted is kept informed and not left out.

Naomi: explained how AGL tackles these issues through 'door knocking' and having resources such as translators should there be language barriers. In regards to Marney's comment regarding trees – there is a fine line as people want to have a hard copy, but we can try and manage this issue by minimising the numbers and sizes etc.

Michael: provided CCC with anecdotal examples where newsletter numbers are minimised following initial consultation and contact with stakeholders.

Gary: in terms of doorknocking sometimes is completely ineffective.
Michael: explained that this is why there are various communication mechanisms in place to try and circulate information.

Richard: suggested 'targeted meetings' as a way of communicating.

Naomi: we can take 'targeted meetings' as a mechanism, but to meet our values and objectives is recognising the groups that we're not getting to. At our community information session we noticed that there were fewer people under 30, community information sites demonstrated less women. So we need to target those people.

Richard: I was particularly impressed at how AGL invited me to allow me to continue to contribute my views to the project.

Michael: explained the process of the 'drop in session' where community members are given the opportunities to speak one-on-one with experts, technical leaders or representatives as opposed to spending a long time in a forum.

Richard: that's the point I'm trying to make so I like that idea.

Naomi: we have a few people drop in, but is there an accessibility issue?

Rod: suggested having a field day to try and encourage the less represented demographics to get involved in the process. A fair proportion of the community have a general interest in the project but they get turned off from attending a community forum or something similar because they don't like them. I think you'll find over time that these field days are genuine and you can build strong relationships with the community and further develop a positive reputation.

Marnie: my concerns are that these sessions might seem false. But I think it's very practical nonetheless.

Naomi: explained how she and Mark have been involved in developing workshops and getting the community involved in a more intimate way.



Marnie: has some agreement with the suggestion of workshops but made a particular comment about the benefit of the site visits. Her view was that people need to see how something operates to understand it and to see how it could potentially impact them.

Naomi: agreed with notion of site visits but further explained the benefits of workshops to allow for the development of ideas and suggestions.

Ian: provided an anecdotal example of the benefits of site visits and suggested it be considered as a way of engaging the community.

Rod: further emphasised Ian's view of the benefits of site visits as occurring early in the consultation.

Mark: concerned about the wells as they are difficult to show, but acknowledged that site visits would be a good idea.

Lisa: highlighted how targeted meetings would be beneficial and stated how peer review of the reports would be greatly appreciated.

Naomi: agreed with Lisa's notion and explained how reports/plans would be reviewed – e.g. traffic – council, water – mid coast water.

Marnie: there needs to be an independent group to allow for the communication material not to appear as 'spin' or 'propaganda'. There also needs to be a focus on social media for targeting younger demographics, but it can be viewed as corporate spin.

Naomi: stated that it's a good idea, but said it would be an 'action on notice' to ensure there's no danger of damaging AGL's reputation by approaching this incorrectly.

Michael: asked for further suggestions for communicating.

Mark: suggested adding the media.

Naomi: explained the minimal conditions of media use (e.g. advertisements in a local newspaper explaining the project).

Marney: suggested signs and asked they be clearly marked.

Naomi: notion agreed to.

Richard: there is a lot of fear from documentaries and shows about gas problems. How would you communicate your risk management to people who think this is bad?

Naomi: what happens is that the way companies communicate risks is quite often in a technical way and the way that communities assess risk is in a totally different space. One of our hurdles is to bridge that gap and we start by understanding and are clear about how communities want to understand what is going on. People general want to understand that there is certainty about what is happening and AGL aspires to try and bridge this gap through all the contact mechanisms and by practising the worst case situations in order to ensure that we are prepared for this.



Richard: suggested emergency services should be a stakeholder and asked that communication should occur with the grass roots.

Mark: suggested that drills should be put in place to ensure there is assurance of safety within the community.

David: explained how 'fracking' is a word that causes intense confusion. If people understood what 'fracking' was there would be less concern.

Gary: suggested that if you tell people too much then there will be a lot of misinformation and fear. It would be an issue due to the distortion of information. I think you should be telling people what you are using and how much, but be careful of how you communicate that information.

Michael: do you mean such as comparing chemicals to recognised examples – e.g. chemical X is the same as the chemical in detergent.

Naomi: explained how fact sheets have done this before.

Gary: strongly disagreed with Naomi and said that this is where the spin comes from. I want full disclosure of what's used and how it's used but without judgemental opinion such as comparing the chemicals to normal household use.

Lisa: explained how people aren't passive and, when given information, will investigate further at home or on Google.

David: explains that this doesn't provide context and that it could cause confusion with the general community.

Gary: full disclosure should still be used, but adding latitudes and judgements can have a very negative affect and be quite problematic for the community.

Naomi: suggested there be further discussion of how AGL get that balance right because, on the one hand there's no context but then there shouldn't be judgements imposed.

Marnie: suggested radio spots and potential question and answer sessions on the radio to discuss the project and to give a larger number of people an opportunity to come in and discuss issues such as 'fracking'. This is great because there is a type of control and independent monitoring – and it would not get the view that it has a type of spin on it.

Naomi: noted this suggestion

Marnie: suggested how the notion of radio spots and ring-ins allows for greater transparency and would be an idea to be considered.

Michael: explained the difficulties of expressing technical information in a plain English way. It is a challenge.

Gary: reaffirmed his view that by adding judgement to chemicals it can be very misleading.



Marnie: returned to her notion of the open forum on radio that allows for the right people to address and answer concerns that might be lingering about the project. People want to be reassured that there is transparency.

11. Complaints process

Richard: How will you register complaints?

Naomi: explained the minimum conditions for the complaints process in extensive detail which includes a complaints register that can be audited at any time and what needs to be added to this register. She reaffirmed that AGL must comply with these conditions. She also highlighted how complaints can be 'open' and 'closed' and what actions were taken by AGL.

Richard: are you going to have someone who will be the complaints receiver? The experiences we have had with other projects have been with the complaint line that has been answered by people who don't know or are not aware of how to answer the complaint.

Mark: explained that there is a protocol and a hierarchy in place where if person A doesn't answer, contact person B, if person B doesn't answer contact person C.

Naomi: further emphasised this by explaining how the phones are always monitored by a community relations officer.

Richard: expressed comfort with this notion that the line would be answered and you wouldn't have to talk to a machine or leave a voicemail.

Marnie: concern that the issues linger and that people have given up on complaining because nothing is done by it. It's important to be honest and to make sure that the actual complaint is dealt with.

Naomi: explained that the responsiveness was really important and suggested whether having AGL monitored by the CCC (and giving people the opportunity to contact the CCC) would provide more confidence?

There was mutual agreement around the table on this suggestion.

Lisa: expressed the desire for further communication in the media for people who might be in and around the area. There are many other communities who may not be affected but might have a vested interest.

Naomi: agreed with the notion and added to communication meeting.

Lisa: suggested that regular liaison with Councillor Paul Hogan and Anna Kaliska (Mid Coast Water) would be good for involving interested communities.



22 Tate Street
Gloucester, NSW, 2422
Australia
Tel: - +61 2 6558 1166
Fax: - +61 2 6558 1066

Rod: suggested greater flow in communication when discussing risks and allowing AGL to provide the opportunity for transparency by being open about the risks that might occur.

Michael: added "crisis flow chart" to the types of information provided.

Naomi: asked for a date to be set for the next meeting.

Michael: suggested a straw poll where everyone is emailed with tentative dates and availabilities.

Naomi and CCC agreed to see results and report in next 2 months.

Meeting concluded at 2:47pm.

7. Next Meeting

To be confirmed

Michael will ask for the committee members to nominate a date and time (from a predetermined list) and will notify the committee of the next meeting date once a majority has been confirmed.

Michael Ulph

GHD – Stakeholder Engagement