



Project:	Silverton Wind Farm
Meeting No:	Third Community Consultative Committee meeting
Date:	Thursday 25 October 2012
Venue and Time:	Silverton Youth Hall 6pm – 8pm
Document:	Meeting notes and actions
Chair/Facilitator:	Kath Elliott (KE), GHD
Minutes:	Rosa Han (RH), AGL
AGL representatives:	Neil Cooke (NC) Manager, Power Development and Amanda Shaw (AS) Community Engagement Manager
Committee Members:	Peter Price, Silverton Committee/ Silverton Hotel
	Helen Murray, Local resident
	Cynthia Langord, Purnamoota Station
	Kevin White, Historic Daydream Mine
	John Taplin, Secretary Silverton Villiage Committee
	Phillip Blore, Belmont Station
	Albert Woodroffe, Silverton Committee, Horizon Galleries
	Cameron Koch, Silver City Minerals
	Anne Bransdon, Chamber of Commerce
Apologies:	Rod Grenfell, Local resident
	Dave Gallagher, Councillor Broken Hill City Council
	Marion Browne, Councillor Broken Hill City Council
	Tiff Brown, Department of Primary Industries, Catchments & Lands
	Steve Radford, Consolidated Mining and Civil
	Naomi Schmidt, Eldee Station
Community observers in attendance:	Approximately 20 including three media representatives from Barrier Daily Truth, ABC Radio and ABC TV

- > 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>1. Welcome</p> <p>Kath Elliott (KE) opened the meeting at 6.05pm and welcomed members of the Silverton Community Consultative Committee (SCCC) and observers in attendance.</p> <p>KE provided an overview of the agenda and introduced Amanda Shaw (AS) who has recently been appointed Community Engagement Manager at AGL.</p> <p>KE also introduced the following guest observers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stuart Maycock, Owner’s Engineer (OE), Aurecon • Nelson Gale, Owner’s Engineer, Aurecon • Scott Lauder (SL), Operations Manager South Australia Wind Farms, AGL • Bill Gephardt (BG), landowner, Hallett Hill Wind Farm <p>KE noted there was no meeting in September as the Hallett trip was arranged for the community members on 11-12 September 2012.</p> <p>The minutes from the August meeting were discussed and adopted with no changes required.</p>	
<p>2. Update on Indigenous representative</p> <p>AS provided an update on the status of inviting an Indigenous representative to join the committee. A meeting had been arranged for the following day with the Aboriginal Land council.</p>	<p>AS to provide an update at next meeting</p>
<p>3. Discussion about the recent Hallett visit</p> <p>KE asked the community who attended the recent Hallett visit to provide comments on what they observed and provide an update to the SCCC and observers.</p> <p>Peter Price (PP) commented that the trip provided him with a further understanding of how the process of developing a wind farm took place. PP also noted that his understanding of the construction process was further enhanced.</p> <p>PP noted he was still concerned about the visual impact of the wind turbines which appeared to be predominant on the landscape from up to 10km away. He advised he felt the setback was critical and would like to have the turbines as far back as possible.</p>	

<p>PP also noted that the noise emitted from the wind turbines varied greatly and that when standing directly below the turbine, a whooshing sound was heard. On the other hand, when standing approximately 5km from the turbines, he noted that the turbines sounded like the sea. PP stated that on the second day of the trip, the attendees were able to witness the wind turbines turning at maximum speed and he found the noise from the wind masked the noise generated by the turbines.</p> <p>PP concluded that until the turbines are installed they will not know for sure what the potential impact could be.</p> <p>He complimented AGL on their professionalism and thanked AGL for providing the attendees the opportunity to experience the wind farms first hand.</p> <p>KE asked for other comments from the attendees.</p> <p>Q1. Who is the owner of the wind farm? There were two different brandings at the Hallett wind farms – AGL and Suzlon.</p> <p>A1. Neil Cooke (NC) responded that AGL developed the Hallett Wind Farms and were responsible for the operations and maintenance of it. Suzlon is the operations and maintenance contractor of the Hallett Wind Farms.</p> <p>It was requested that the presentation made by Scott Lauder be uploaded on the project website.</p> <p>There were no other comments about the Hallett trip from the community.</p>	<p>AS to arrange for Scott Lauders presentation to be uploaded onto the project website within a week</p>
<p>KE gave the committee and attendees an opportunity to ask questions to the Hallett Hill landowner, Bill Gephardt (BG):</p> <p>Q1. Have you come across people at Hallett who have been affected by low tones and whose health has also been affected?</p> <p>A1. BG noted he was only aware of one person who has an issue with noise at Hallett wind farm.</p> <p>Q2. How far away are you from the nearest turbines?</p> <p>A2. Approximately 700 metres from the nearest turbine and this is in line with all EPA requirements.</p> <p>AS noted that noise was an important topic to discuss further and advised a noise consultant would be invited to present at the next SCCC.</p> <p>AS provided information about the Macarthur Wind Farm that has recently started operating. She noted there is additional monitoring being conducted beyond the permit requirements to ensure any potential community concerns are addressed.</p>	

<p>BG commented on television reception monitoring that took place at the Hallett wind farms. He stated that AGL were professional and made sure they did all the appropriate checks.</p> <p>KE added that there will be an opportunity to discuss television reception further in future meetings.</p> <p>Q3. Were there any problems with the aviation lights?</p> <p>A3: These are no longer required so were switched off.</p> <p>Q4: Did anyone have any problems with their television or radio?</p> <p>A4: One person had a slight issue and as a solution, AGL provided a new repeater box and now he's satisfied. There were no other issues that he is aware of.</p> <p>BG stated that from his observations, sheep seem to like the turbines as they follow the shade of the turbine as there are no trees in the area.</p>	
<p>4. Project Update, Neil Cooke provided update</p> <p>Key points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AGL issued Expression of Interest (EOI) in early August and received 9 responses to this from various entities • An analysis of these EOI's is currently underway • This will be narrowed down to 4-5 entities who will receive the Request for Tender (RFT) • RFT in September 2012 • Stuart and Nelson, the Owner's Engineer (OE) from Aurecon will help prepare the technical specifications for the tender • Tenderers will have 4 months to respond then the OE helps with the technical analysis • AGL will receive the tenders on March 2013 • OE was appointed in mid September 2012 <p>NC noted access options to the site are currently being investigated. He advised there was a strong preference to avoid going through the centre of Broken Hill. Two different options were presented to the SCCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Short bypass – Barrier Highway up Silverton Rd along an existing track approximately costing is \$3 million • Option 2 (in response to community's suggestion): Longer bypass – direct route from Barrier Highway through to Silverton Rd. This is approximately priced at \$7 million - \$8 million <p>It was noted that only preliminary investigations had been carried out and a lot more work was required.</p>	

<p>NC stated that there were two dips that needed attention in order to make it suitable to bring in oversized loads along Silverton Road. He noted there will be between 3-5 oversized loads per day during construction that will travel at approximately 60km/hr. This will take about 15-20 mins to travel from 16 Daydream Mine Rd.</p>	
<p>Questions from the SCCC:</p> <p>Q1. Does that mean the road will be blocked for 2 hours out of the day?</p> <p>A1. NC advised it's approximately 1.5 hours each day that oversized vehicles would be travelling at 60 km/hour. Two-way traffic would remain.</p> <p>Q2. Can the oversized deliveries happen at any time? Can they be scheduled for early mornings?</p> <p>A2. NC noted if the community has preferred times/times to avoid, AGL would endeavour to schedule the deliveries around these times.</p> <p>Q3. Have there been discussions with the RMS to see if the oversized loads can operate during out of hours i.e. at night time?</p> <p>A3. Joe Sulicich from RMS who was present at the meeting answered that his initial understanding is that oversized loads aren't allowed to travel at night, however he would need to confirm this.</p> <p>A SCCC member raised concerns about the potential impact on tourism that could arise from these oversized vehicles travelling at a reduced speed along Silverton Road. The member stated that he believed the additional travel time on the road would deter tourism buses from coming to the area. The member expressed his preference for the long bypass compared to the short bypass as people will be able to take an alternative route at the end of the project.</p> <p>Q4. Why can't another road be put in alongside the Daydream Mine road?</p> <p>A4. NC noted upgrading existing roads is reasonably straightforward. However, the process for putting in new roads is difficult as there are various other factors to consider such as environment and heritage surveys and approvals.</p> <p>Q5. How wide are the loads?</p> <p>A5. It is the width of a regular truck. Two-way traffic can continue when overside loads are brought in.</p>	

<p>A member from the community noted that during a previous discussion with Broken Hill City Council, he had been advised that it was illegal for oversized deliveries to occur at night. The member also noted that he didn't believe these oversized deliveries would have a negative impact on tourists and tourism buses.</p> <p>KE noted that there were different views from the community in regards to road access. It was agreed that more investigation was required (including discussions with Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) about what can and can't be done.)</p> <p>It was agreed that this topic will be revisited once there was more information.</p>	<p>AGL to investigate options and report back to the committee once more information is available</p>
<p>A discussion on turbine locations continued.</p> <p>NC acknowledged PP's comments in regards to the turbines being visible. He noted AGL understands some members of the community are concerned about the location of the turbines.</p> <p>He advised the turbine locations had not yet been set and would not be set for at least another 5-6 months.</p> <p>NC noted when AGL go through the Request for Tender stage, tenderers will be asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Provide the optimum dollar per Megawatt hour solution (the best wind speed and the best amount of electricity that is generated from it). 2) Provide options if certain turbine locations (the community's least preferred locations) can be excluded. <p>An assessment would then be made.</p> <p>NC noted during the EOI process, respondents submitted suggestions on turbine locations. Out of nine respondents, eight used turbines locations only from the south of the site. There was also one response where the respondent used a number of turbines located from the north of the site. NC showed the SCCC a map that has been produced by one of the respondents as an example. NC explained that he had requested permission from the respondent to show this map at the meeting however, as it is commercially sensitive information, it will not be reproduced in the public domain.</p> <p>KE asked NC to clarify what was negotiable, what was not negotiable and what level of contribution the SCCC can expect to have in these discussions.</p>	

NC reiterated AGL's commitment to working with the community wherever possible. He noted he would like to understand the community's views on the locations they feel strongly about.

He advised when AGL goes out for tender they will receive four or five tenders. This will then be narrowed down to three tenderers who will each advise their preferred locations. NC advised AGL would then bring these options back to the committee for further discussion before a decision was made.

KE clarified that AGL is committed to listening to the community and taking into consideration their preferences whenever possible however, there may be some instances where a decision has to be made that is not exactly what the community are wanting.

A SCCC member expressed dissatisfaction that the original map that NC provided to the community did not have Silverton located on it. The member would like future maps to show the distance of turbines in relation to Silverton.

NC confirmed that when he comes back with tender responses the distances will be marked on the maps.

NC showed an image to the SCCC on Google Earth which showed the 6km radius from Silverton.

The following questions were asked by the SCCC members:

Q1. Is there an electrical ombudsman we can talk to in order to secure the 6km radius?

A1. NC noted it is important to remember the turbine locations have already been approved however he thought there were options to work with. He stated that there have been 282 locations approved and the expectation is only 75-100 of these will be used.

Q2. Will the turbines be located closer to the ridge rather than in centre?

A2. This depends on the wind speeds of the locations.

KE asked NC if he was able to arrange a visual representation so the community can get a feel for what it's going to look like. NC confirmed he will make this available to the community.

Q3. Can the buffer zone be extended so it's 6km from the nearest houses?

A3. NC confirmed this would be considered as part of the tenders' proposal.

NC to ensure a map is provided clearly showing the tenderers preferred locations and the relative distances to Silverton.

NC to arrange imagery to be developed to provide a visual representation of what the turbines would look like.

<p>Q4. Can we see the wind results from testing and the relationship of the wind speeds to these areas?</p> <p>A4. NC confirmed he will bring this information to the next meeting.</p> <p>Q5. Can you explain the reason behind the selection of 100 turbine locations?</p> <p>A5. NC noted the original proposal for the wind farm was 598 turbines and a capacity of 1000 MW. The capacity of the power line on site is for 230-250 MW and a parallel line was discussed. However, the cost of this would be approximately \$300 million and that is not commercially viable.</p> <p>NC advised AGL is currently only considering one stage for this project. The turbines will be approximately 2.5 to 3 MW per turbine and only 70-100 turbines will be required.</p> <p>A member of the SCCC commented that he would like the media to make sure they reported the correct MW for the project as often the media still referred to 285 MW in the local paper which can send mixed messages.</p> <p>Q6. What will the size of these turbines be in relation to the ones at Hallett?</p> <p>A6. Hallett wind farms: 2.1 MW per turbine, 80 metre tower and 88m blades. Silverton is proposed for: 2.5-3 MW per turbine, shortest tower 84 metre, tallest tower 95 metre and blades between 112-118m approximately.</p> <p>NC also provided additional information about the RFT. He is currently working with the Industry Capability Network (ICN) who is focussed on getting Australian input in projects in Australia. In the RFT there will be an appendix for numerous Broken Hill and surrounding area businesses that will encourage the tenderers to use those businesses.</p> <p>Q7: When AGL purchased the project from Epuron, was it for 282 sites or 598 sites?</p> <p>A7. The project approval consists of 2 parts - project approval which is 282 sites and concept approval which takes it up to 598 sites. In order to take the wind farm up to the larger capacity, another approval will be required. This is currently not being considered by AGL.</p>	<p>NC to present at the next meeting the findings of the wind speed testing and where the highest wind speed is.</p>
---	--

<p>AS gave an update on the Macarthur Wind Farm located in Victoria. Key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the last 4 weeks turbines started to be commissioned. • First turbines commissioned on 30 September • Noise monitoring currently underway from September • Macarthur Wind Farm has strict noise monitoring requirements and AGL is going beyond what the permit requires. <p>KE asked the community if they had any questions. No questions were asked.</p>	
<p>5. Community Commitments</p> <p>AS discussed the community commitments that were initially made by Epuron as part of the project approval documentation. She noted that nothing had changed and AGL will uphold all commitments made.</p> <p>The SCCC will have an opportunity in being involved in determining how the Silverton Community Fund will be spent to ensure it is meaningful. This will be discussed further and AGL will also be liaising with Broken Hill City Council.</p> <p>AS also explained to the community about the roll out of AGL's VIP package. This will be rolled out shortly and more information will be provided at the next SCCC for community members who are interested. The package includes a 15% discount on electricity and 12% discount on gas.</p>	
<p>6. Discuss sourcing of sand and road-based materials</p> <p>NC discussed the sourcing of sand and road-based material. He explained that the key objective is to minimise traffic and reduce the number of truck movements.</p> <p>The key materials that AGL would like to source are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sand • Cement • Concrete aggregate • Road base material <p>NC added that Stuart and Nelson (OE) were currently in Silverton to start investigating how they can secure material onsite and minimise truck movements. This would make the project greener and also minimise damage and risk on roads.</p> <p>No questions were asked from the SCCC.</p>	

7. Community Update

KE opened up discussions amongst the SCCC members and observers.

Q1. Can you please explain the statements made by AGL at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) and what impact this will have on the Silverton project?

A1. A statement was made at the AGM that AGL will be suspending investment commitments in South Australia. However, AGL's commitment to the Silverton Wind Farm project remains. This project is still planned to go to the board for funding approval in Q3 2013 and the decision will be made based on market conditions. AGL is still committed to the Silverton project.

Q2. Which grid will the electricity generated from these turbines get fed into?

A2. The grid is all interconnected and the electricity from these turbines will flow into the Eastern Australian grid.

BG commented that during the construction stage of the Hallett wind farms, all the sand and concrete were transported from outside the site at night. He also explained that the Police had strict protocols around escorting the trucks and this occurred at certain hours that were not negotiable.

Q3. How wide is the base of the turbine?

A3. A community member who attended the Hallett trip answered it was approximately 8 metres.

Concern was raised from community members that this was wider than the Silverton Rd. KE confirmed that there will be further investigations around this topic and this will be discussed in more detail in future meetings.

The different laws in South Australia and NSW were discussed amongst the community members. Questions were raised about the process of police escorts for oversized loads from one state to another. A SCCC member suggested that it would be beneficial if the Police were invited to a SCCC meeting to discuss this process in detail.

Q4. Will you be extracting sand from our local creeks or will you be bringing it in? And if you extract it locally, will this be done at night?

A4. NC stated he was meeting with Crown Lands the next day and further information will be provided at the next meeting. NC expressed that it was preferred that the sand was sourced locally to minimise traffic movements.

The project approval states that work is only allowed between 7am and 6pm Monday to Friday and between 8am and 1pm on Saturdays. No work is allowed on Sundays and on public holidays.

AS to invite a police representative to attend a future CCC

<p>Q5. How will you be accessing water?</p> <p>A5. There have been initial discussions with Country Water. The water will be primarily used for concrete for the wind tower base. Country Water recommended the Uمبرumberka reservoir as the water was not able to be accessed off the pipeline due to issues with the pump.</p> <p>Q6. How much water is needed?</p> <p>A6. NC to investigate and report back to the committee. It was noted that it would be beneficial to invite a representative from Country Water to attend a future meeting.</p> <p>Q7. Dust depression uses a lot of water. How much water does AGL need for that?</p> <p>A7. NC to investigate and report back to the committee.</p> <p>Q8. What happens at the end of the project? Who cleans up/removes the turbines after 25 years?</p> <p>A8. NC explained that AGL is responsible. He went on to explain that the turbines typically have a lifespan of 25 years and if the turbines don't spin for a continuous 12 month period, they will be pulled down. The concrete pads will remain.</p> <p>Q9. What happens after 25 years?</p> <p>A9. A member of the community who attended the Hallett visit stated that at this trip, the technicians explained that after 25 years this current technology will be out of date and new technology will be available.</p> <p>NC to clarify this and discuss at next meeting.</p> <p>Q10. A couple of meetings ago, AGL was invited to attend the Broken Hill Council Traffic Committee meetings. It was stated that this meeting would be discussed at the next SCCC which has not yet occurred. Can you provide an update to us on this?</p> <p>A10. NC explained that AGL was invited to attend a meeting however this has not yet taken place. It was agreed that when he does attend he will report back to the SCCC.</p> <p>Q11. What happens when we experience large dust storms? How do the turbines handle these?</p> <p>A11. SL answered this question from the perspective of the Hallett wind farms. He stated that dust storms do not affect the operations of the turbines and does not create bigger dust storms. He also stated that a small percentage of dust migrates into the turbine towers when they are being serviced.</p>	<p>AS to invite Country Water to attend a future CCC</p> <p>NC to determine how much water will be needed for the project (including dust suppression)</p> <p>NC to find out more information about what happens after the turbines have been operational for 25 years.</p> <p>AGL to provide update to SCCC once meeting held with Traffic Committee.</p>
---	--

<p>8. Next meeting and close</p> <p>The SCCC agreed that they would like AGL to invite a noise expert to the next meeting.</p> <p>KE asked the SCCC what other topics they would like to discuss. KE stated that the noise presentation will take up most of the time at the next meeting so there may not be time to discuss other topics.</p> <p>The following topics for future meetings were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise – November meeting • TV reception and phone reception– Future meeting • Traffic Management Plan discussions with Police and RMS • Invite Country Water to meeting to discuss the project’s impact on water usage • Health • Potential benefits the project can bring to the community – it was suggested by AS that a presentation by the Clean Energy Council (CEC) may be an option. CEC would be able to explain to the SCCC how this project fits into the renewable energy picture • Further discussion on roads 	
<p>KE discussed the SCCC meetings for December and January and whether the SCCC wanted to have a meeting in these months. It was agreed that the December meeting will not occur and the SCCC will decide by the next meeting if they want to go forward with the January meeting.</p> <p>Scott Lauder noted in South Australia, the mid north region had a potential for interference with TV reception and AGL looked at improving the reception in this whole area. As a solution, a repeater tower was considered as an option however this was not a financially viable option so the decision was made to install digital satellites instead. He noted the feedback they received was very positive as not everyone had issues with their reception to begin with. Through this broad solution, reception had improved.</p> <p>NC also extended a broad invitation to the SCCC and observers to the Chamber of Commerce breakfast the following morning. NC explained he was invited to present on the Silverton Wind Farm and the proposed Solar Farm in Broken Hill.</p>	
<p>Meeting closed at 7.30pm.</p>	