

COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
AGL – CAMDEN GAS COMMITTEE

MEETING NO. 59

Meeting held on site at Rosalind Park Gas Plant and online via Team 13 April 2023

MINUTES

Member/Guest	Attendance Type
Aaron Clifton AGL (AC)	Apologies
Catherine Mooney AGL (CM)	Present
David Henry (DH) (Wollondilly Council)	Present (online)
Shane Bottin AGL (SB)	Present
Diane Gordon (DG) (community)	Present
Lauren Ackerly (LA) (Wollondilly Council)	Present (online)
Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MMH) (Chair)	Present
Mitchell Clark (MC) (Campbelltown City Council)	Present (online)
Michaela Beattie (MB) (Campbelltown City Council)	Present (online)
Pauline Stamedes (PS)	Apologies
Rachel Marks AGL (RM)	Present
Sally Mayberry (SM) (Minutes)	Present (online)
Simon Hennings (SH) (community)	Present
Troy Platten (TP) (community)	Present
Vanessa Luck (VL) (Camden City Council)	Present (online)
William Benson (WB) (Barrigal Landcare) (community)	Present
Teresa Chang AGL (TC)	Present
Matt Deeth (MD) Deputy Mayor Wollondilly Council	Present

Meeting opened: 5:05pm

ITEM	ACTION	DUE DATE
<p>1.0 Welcome, Introduction and Apologies MMH – Welcome and Introductions. Apologies as above.</p>		
<p>2.0 Declarations of interest MMH is the independent chair appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment. Chairs several CCC's and is a paid chair of this meeting.</p>		
<p>3.0 Legacy Brief and Guidelines – See attached Presentation CM noted the previous CCC meeting had discussed the long term community initiatives. This meeting is to discuss in details the concept. AGL is working towards closing down the Camden site by August 2023. In the 2024 Financial year, AGL are looking to make a financial contribution to the community to thank the community for their long term support.</p>		

<p>AGL propose that 5 CCC members nominate to join a panel with AGL representatives to review and assess applications.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed dates: May 1 2023 – Applications open June 16 2023 – Applications close June 30 2023 – Applications assessed</p> <p>Question: When is it proposed for all grants to be expended by? Answer: It is a point for conversation. The local community grants scheme is normally a 12 months/ \$5000 contribution. This scenario is looking at \$100-150,000 and we should have a conversation about the window of availability.</p> <p>Comment: Ideally, councils would prefer to leverage the maximum amount of time, but from council perspective, the longer the better (18 months – 24 months). DH & LA: confirmation that 18-24 month timeframe would be good.</p> <p>Comment MMH: a guideline that allows each application to be assessed on each application's merit might be beneficial.</p> <p>Comment CM: AGL would not seek to have unused funds returned at the 2 year mark, but a timeframe is ideal and will need to be documented.</p> <p>Comment TP: Building something from scratch is worth considering with timing; a milestone payment may be worth considering.</p> <p>Comment and general consensus: At the final closure point, it would be nice to have a celebration, to mark the occasion for various reasons.</p> <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on project that leaves a legacy – spend the money and deliver the project. If a project can't be completed in 12-18 months, the relevance of the donation to the community may not be relevant. • Environmental projects can take two to three years to get the desired outcomes. • Each application should be assessed on its own merits. • Community engagement for council takes a lot of time. • Ordering equipment can also take months (eg. 4 month lead time for playground equipment). • Milestone achievements could be considered, especially if the funding is part of a larger funded concept. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AGL are not looking to deliver milestone payments; rather a lump sum payment. • Can community organisations apply for the funding? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Councils are part of the governance structure and will also be the recipients of the funding as well as community organisations. • It is expected that the funding will most likely reside on council property that will require ongoing maintenance. AGL funding cannot be directed towards ongoing maintenance works. • Approval from the 'landowner' (council) is a necessity in the application process as part of the key criteria. • Appropriate recognition of AGL should also be included in the criteria, depending on the nature of the project. Providing a definition on what this might look like is a good idea. • AGL have contributed a lot to the community over the years, but the judging panel could have an input in the value of AGL as a good corporate citizen and neighbour over the years. • Prioritising awarding the grants – consider defining what is a 'long term' legacy project, and contained to within the local area. 	<p>CM: Update the guidelines according to the feedback from this meeting.</p>	<p>As soon as practical.</p>
---	---	------------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key areas of investment – provide examples and firm guidelines around what it might look like, with evidence of a long term plan. • An example is community resilience and social capacity is a current talking point in the community. • Is a project plan/grant chart going to be included in the application? • Demonstration/proposed outcomes that the group is hoping to achieve. • Could it be considered amalgamating the funding between councils due to the boundary overlap. • Councils will take the lead. • Nominations for the committee – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One representative (suggest council officer) per LGA of Wollondilly, Campbelltown, Camden. ○ (Consider conflicts of interest with councillors that may be submitting the applications). ○ Need for a transparent and accountable process ○ Two members from the community representatives. ○ TP and WB accepted nomination with option to co-opt other remaining community members if needed. <p>Question: Will the funding be able to support salary as part of project? It is not addressed as part of the guidelines. Answer: Typically, AGL doesn't direct money towards salary, however if circumstances prevail, it could be considered. It would be questioned how compatible it is with a legacy project.</p> <p>Question: is there a time frame for the panel forming and the first meeting? Is mid-June long enough? Discussion: The process is quite simple for applying; a six week lead time seems fair and reasonable. All agreed.</p> <p>Minutes of the Assessment Panel to be taken of the decision making process.</p> <p>Question: How will AGL get the information out to the community? Answer: The level of funding that AGL is targeting means that AGL are envisaging working closely with councils, which also includes how AGL communicates with the larger community.</p> <p>Question: Will the application process stipulate how much of the expenses can be spent on the intangible costs of planning the project (eg. engineering)? Answer: Funding should be maximised towards the outcome. It is unlikely to be approved for a project that utilises 50-60% of the total funding for designing/architect/planning/engineering. The funding should be more directed towards shovel-ready projects.</p> <p>Question: Where will meetings for the review panel be? Answer: It can be flexible, but meeting in person is the preference. The location to be discussed and confirmed.</p> <p>Question: When should nominations from councils for the review panel be in? Answer: One week from today (20 April 2023).</p> <p>Comment: the last round of the community funding is open until the end of April 2023. No applications have been received yet.</p>	<p>Councils to nominate review panel members to AGL by 20 April 2023.</p> <p>MMH to email all members regarding the review panel process and due date.</p> <p>All to disseminate through their networks.</p>	
<p>4.0 Next meeting date 6 September 2023</p>		

Meeting closed at: 6:35pm