



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Project:</b>                           | <b>Silverton Wind Farm</b>  |
| <b>Meeting No:</b>                        | 8   |
| <b>Date:</b>                              | Thursday 27 June 2013   |
| <b>Venue and Time:</b>                    | Silverton Youth Hall<br>6pm – 8pm   |
| <b>Document:</b>                          | Meeting notes and actions   |
| <b>Chair/Facilitator:</b>                 | Kath Elliott (KE)   |
| <b>Minutes:</b>                           | Rosa Han (RH), AGL  |
| <b>AGL representatives:</b>               | Neil Cooke (NC) Manager, Power Development<br>Frances Duffy (FD) Manager Community Engagement |
| <b>Committee Members:</b>                 | Cynthia Langford, Purnamoota Station  |
|   | Kevin White, Historic Daydream Mine   |
|   | Phillip Blore, Belmont Station  |
|   | Dennis Roach, Chamber of Commerce   |
|   | John Taplin, Secretary Silverton Village Committee  |
|   | Rod Grenfell, Local resident  |
|   | Peter Price, Silverton Committee/ Silverton Hotel   |
|   | Marion Browne, Councillor Broken Hill City Council  |
|   | Tiff Brown, Department of Primary Industries, Catchments & Lands                              |
|   | Albert Woodroffe, Silverton Committee, Horizon Galleries                                      |
|   | Helen Murray, Local resident  |
| <b>Apologies</b>                          | Dave Gallagher, Councillor Broken Hill City Council   |
|   | Maureen O'Donnell, Traditional Owner  |
|   | Joanne O'Donnell, Broken Hill Land Council  |
|   | Naomi Schmidt, Eldee Station  |
|   | Cameron Koch, Silver City Minerals  |
|   | Steve Radford, Consolidated Mining and Civil  |
| <b>Community observers in attendance:</b> | Approximately 15  |

## Meeting Minutes

| Item  | Action |
|---|--------|
| <p><b>1. Welcome</b></p> <p>Kath Elliott (KE) opened the meeting at 6:00pm and welcomed members of the Silverton Community Consultative Committee (SCCC) and observers in attendance.</p> <p>KE provided an overview of the agenda and noted that some members had difficulties accessing the Simon Chapman's presentation on the CD provided. It was agreed that AGL would re-send the information and the agenda item on health would be deferred until the next meeting.</p> <p>The minutes from the May 2013 meeting were discussed. KE asked the CCC if they believed the minutes were a true and accurate record of the meeting. The committee accepted the minutes and the May minutes were adopted by the committee with no changes required.</p> <p>KE noted that attendance of CCC members was raised by some members. KE read out the Terms of Reference (TOR) to the CCC to remind CCC members of their responsibilities to the community. KE emphasised that the role of CCC members is to represent the wider community rather than their individual interests.</p>   |        |
| <p><b>2. Project status update, Neil Cooke</b></p> <p>NC provided a project update to the committee. He noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bypass road from Broken Hill was approved by the Broken Hill City Council on Wednesday, 19 June 2013.</li> <li>• The next stage is to obtain formal environmental surveys and Aboriginal heritage surveys of the road. This will take approximately 3-4 months</li> <li>• There is no update on the tender process as the shortlisting has not been finalised as the process has taken longer than expected. An update will be provided at the next meeting</li> <li>• The new Community Engagement Manager will be announced at the next CCC meeting. NC thanked Frances Duffy (FD) for her contribution acting in the role.</li> </ul> <p>A community member expressed concerns about the bypass road coming onto the Silverton Rd.</p> <p>NC advised that as per the project approvals, there is a requirement for the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to meet the requirements of Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and there will be consultation with the RMS closer to the construction stage.</p> |        |

### 3. Additional information on distances from turbines

NC provided additional information on distances from turbines following on from the previous CCC meeting.

Questions:

Q1. Will we be able to get a copy of this slide?

A1. NC advised he will need to take this question on notice due to the confidentiality of the tender locations. He will liaise with the individual tenderers and advise.

*Post-meeting clarification notes:*

*The presentation slide containing additional information on distances from turbines has been removed from the presentation that is on the Silverton website due to commercial sensitivity.*

Q2. What is the legal minimum distance the turbines need to be from a residence?

A2. The distance of wind turbine from residences in NSW is determined by a limit on noise at a residence, not a distance.

Q3. Are you able to say at this point in time who the two shortlisted tenderers are?

A3. NC answered that the tenderers have not yet been shortlisted.

Q4. Who is the resident of the 'Silverton house' (as noted in the slide)?

A4. *Please refer to A6.*

Q5. Can you tell us which tenderers are the front runners?

A5. NC advised he was not able to answer this as the tender shortlisting process is currently underway.

Q6. The 'Silverton house' should be Bob's house but it doesn't look like it. Are there any residences that are closer?

A6. No, Bob's house is the closest to the wind turbines

Q7. It is obvious that the topic of distance from turbines to residents is very important to the committee. How important is this to AGL?

A7. NC answered that the community was important to the decision making process and the community's views were being considered along with the rate of return for each of the tenderers.

Q8. Once the tenderer is decided, is there room for the community to have input on the turbine locations?

A8. NC provided background on the negotiation process. He noted that there are two parts to the negotiations – commercial and technical. These negotiations happen at the same time and take approximately 6 weeks to finalise.

Q9. KE asked NC if community expectations were included in the technical commercial process or the technical process.

A9. NC answered it will be considered in the technical process, for example, ensuring that the noise requirements set out in the project approvals are met.

Q10. KE asked NC to provide details on the next step of discussions with the committee.

A10. NC advised that once the tenderers have been shortlisted, he will share this information with the committee.

Q11. Once you have advised us of the shortlisted entities at the next meeting, will the Silverton CCC have the opportunity to provide input on their preferences?

A11. NC noted that if the tenderers who have turbine locations that are close to Silverton are shortlisted, this will be flagged during the technical negotiations process.

NC clarified that AGL will make the final decision on selecting the tenderer and the feedback from the community will be considered in this process.

Q12. Why didn't you advise the tenderers that no turbines were to be placed within 6km from Silverton instead?

A12. NC explained that there are 282 approved turbine locations for this project and AGL have asked tenderers to provide options on their optimum layout for the wind farm and to take into consideration the community's views. He advised that AGL will consider different viewpoints when moving forward with the tender process.

Q13. Will the CCC be advised of the two shortlisted entities?

A13. NC answered that this will be discussed at the CCC meeting once the shortlist has been finalised.

Q14. KE asked NC if that meeting will need to be a closed session or if the tenderers are able to be publically named.

A14. NC answered that the names of the tenderers (company names) will be discussed at the CCC meeting once the shortlisting process has been finalised and this will also be available in the public domain.

KE provided a recap to the committee that the shortlisting process has taken longer than initially thought and this will be announced at the next meeting. The discussion with the community at the next meeting will then be fed into AGL's decision making process.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Comments from the CCC:</p> <p>John Taplin (JT) commented that if the turbine locations within 6km were taken out to begin with, this would have saved AGL money and the tenderers time as there would be no need to go back and analyse the locations.</p> <p>Albert Woodroffe (AW) commented that 22,000 people visit his gallery each year and most are aware of the proposed wind farm in Silverton. He noted that many are distressed and appalled by this and have made negative comments. AW also noted that he has also heard many positive comments from others and there seems to be mixed opinions on wind farms.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>4. Discussion around health and wind farms</b></p> <p>KE noted that members were unable to watch Simon Chapman’s presentation due to technical difficulties with the CD provided.</p> <p>Two members had watched the presentation.</p> <p>An observer noted that if some people don’t have the capability to watch it (either online or on the CD) they can email Simon Chapman and receive a transcript instead.</p> <p>This agenda item has been deferred to the next meeting.</p>   | <p>AGL to have another CD made up by the IT department and distributed to members by the next meeting.</p> |
| <p><b>5. Other business</b></p> <p>There was a discussion about committee membership attendance.</p> <p>KE asked the members in attendance their thoughts on members who rarely attend meetings and what action should be taken.</p> <p>Cynthia Langford (CL) noted that there are two members on the committee who haven’t attended any meetings and two members who have only attended one meeting. She noted that there are 2-3 people in the gallery who make the effort to attend every meeting and therefore should be provided the opportunity to replace the members. CL commented that on another committee she is a member of, there is a rule that if members miss five consecutive meetings, they are out of the committee.</p> <p>KE referred to the TOR and noted there is no guidance in the TOR on this matter. There is a criteria which states: <i>Be willing to commit to attending each of the monthly meetings held and any additional meetings held to address key issues.</i></p> |  |

KE asked the other members for their views.

Kevin White (KW) stated that if they can't make the meetings on a regular basis, they should not be on it.

A question was asked about the two Indigenous representatives. KE confirmed that AGL have met with the representatives of Land Council on a number of occasions and that to ensure the Aboriginal community is informed about the project and has the opportunity to participate. Helen Murray (HM) agreed that if members weren't able to attend the CCC meetings they should not be on the committee and others should be invited to fill their positions.

KE noted that this was a common issue that occurs at this stage of a project and it was AGL's view that this is a matter for the committee to decide on. KE asked members if they would like to vote on the matter.

Dennis Roach (DR) commented that he believed more time and thought was required in this decision. He asked the CCC to wait until the next meeting and vote on this matter then.

Marion Browne (MB) noted there was only one Council representative on the committee and that position was shared by herself and Dave Gallagher (DG).

A question was asked if AGL can send out a notification to all CCC members advising of this matter. KE noted this will be minuted and she would also call around to members and ask their views.

KE also noted that the TOR could be changed to reflect the committee's views on membership criteria.

Peter Price (PP) commented that the members who rarely attend or don't attend meetings should be contacted and given a chance before a decision is made.

AW noted that the closer the project is to construction, the better the attendance will be.

There was a discussion around other topics the committee wanted to discuss at future CCC meetings.

KE noted that other topics that were raised by members were property values and electromagnetic interference.

KE raised the community investment fund as a topic of interest. She noted that the process for deciding how the community investment fund will be established can be discussed together with the committee. KE asked if anyone had a particular view about the community fund at this stage.

AW noted that the Silverton Village Committee (SVC) had met with NC a fortnight ago and had preliminary discussions around the community fund.

NC clarified to the CCC that this discussion with the SVC was in regards to extracting sand from the creek and he had not expected to have a discussion about the community fund at this meeting.

KW commented that he believed the Daydream Mine should receive a financial gain from the fund as there would be a big impact on the business due to the use of Daydream Mine Rd to bring turbines on.

KE noted that the community fund should be discussed in detail at a future CCC meeting where the committee can discuss how they believe the fund should be administered and what the process should look like.

There was a discussion amongst the members in regards to discussing this with the Silverton community at a SVC meeting instead where an AGL representative can be invited.

KE clarified that AGL will take the advice of the CCC on how they would like the community fund to operate. She noted that if there are discussions around the fund at a SVC meeting, the SVC representative can table the suggestions to the CCC for endorsement. KE noted that the SVC is a unique organisation and AGL has not worked with a community similar to this one previously. KE confirmed that AGL will seek advice from the CCC as this committee represents a wider group than the SVC.

HM raised to KE that a question she asked at the previous CCC meeting was not minuted. She noted that she had asked Councillor Browne if the committee can be invited to attend a bus tour that was hosted by Broken Hill City Council of the bypass road.

Questions:

Q1. Will the community fund involve the Silverton community or the wider community including Broken Hill and Far West?

A1. KE answered that this will be up to the committee.

Q2. How has the community fund been set up for the Hallett Wind Farms?

A2. NC answered that there is an individual fund for each wind farm and there is a committee responsible for administering the funds. The committee consists of two community representatives and an AGL representative. The fund is advertised in the local paper and requests are received annually.

KE suggested that AGL distribute the draft Coopers Gap Community Fund document and details of the Hallett wind farms community funds to the SCCC. This can then be discussed further at the next meeting. KE advised she is happy to facilitate a workshop on the community fund.

RH to send out Coopers Gap draft community fund document and the Hallett document to SCCC members

## 6. Next meeting and close

KE reminded CCC members and observers that the next meeting would be held on 25 July 2013.

Topics that will be discussed at future meetings include:

- Property values and wind farms
- Wind turbines and electromagnetic interference
- Community Fund
- Simon Chapman's presentation on health (next meeting)

Q1. Have you found there to be interference with TV's and radios from turbines?

A1. NC noted that when Scott Lauder, Wind Energy Operations Manager SA, was invited to attend the October 2012 CCC meeting, he noted that interference with TV's were identified at one of the Hallett wind farms and this was traced to a faulty transformer which got rectified. NC advised that if there is any TV interference it is AGL's responsibility to fix it.

KE closed the meeting at 7.30pm