



Project:	Coopers Gap Wind Farm	
Meeting No:	Second Community Consultative Committee meeting	
Date:	Thursday 14 June 2012	
Venue and Time:	Cooranga North Community Hall 10am – approximately 12.30pm	
Document:	Meeting notes and actions	
Chair/Facilitator:	Barbara Campany (BC) GHD	
Minutes:	Sara van der Schatte Olivier (SO) GHD	
AGL representatives:	Nigel Bean (NB) Project Director and Evan Carless (EC) Project Manager	
Committee Members:	Ian Schafferius	Participating landowner
	Sue Sinammon	Participating landowner
	Bryan Lyons	Concerned Citizens Association
	Margaret O'Brien	Neighbour
	Bruce Gooderham	Neighbour
	Rod Kane	Neighbour
	Tom Hoare	Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters
	Cyril Stewart	Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters
	Chris Du Plessis	South Burnett Regional Council
	Mal Collinge	Local Aboriginal Elder
Apologies:	Jane Holdsworth	Western Downs Regional Council
Community observers in attendance:	Approximately 17	

### Meeting Minutes

Item	Action
1. Welcome and overview of today's agenda BC opened the meeting, welcomed the committee members and the community observers. BC confirmed that all committee members had received the pack of information distributed. BC also introduced Mal Collinge who is a local traditional elder in the area and had nominated to participate as a member on the CCC.	Noted

- > 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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An observer expressed concern that the facilitator was not independent because GHD works on wind farm projects. BC explained she had not positioned herself as independent but rather an experienced facilitator to help establish community consultative committees.</li> <li>• Whilst a number of committee members showed support for BC to continue as the facilitator of the CCC, a few community observers and a couple of committee members said they would like a facilitator or chair who did not have ties to the wind farm industry.</li> <li>• A suggestion was made that the committee work with AGL to agree and appoint an independent chair.</li> <li>• It was explained that this process can take some time as criteria and the role for the chair will need to be defined, advertisements placed and then nominations assessed.</li> <li>• It was agreed that BC would facilitate until an independent chair was nominated and appointed.</li> <li>• A comment was made that the CCC process felt one sided – facilitator appointed by AGL and terms of reference prepared by AGL.</li> <li>• BC explained that the terms of reference distributed were draft and are dynamic in nature. If committee members would like to add or modify these terms then AGL is happy to discuss this with the CCC.</li> <li>• It was confirmed that this group has been established to act as a community peak body to discuss community concerns and shape outcomes. It is not a decision making body, rather a decision influencing body.</li> <li>• CCC members confirmed they are happy for their names to be published on AGL's website however any enquiries about the CCC to be directed to AGL's 1800 number.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: Names of CCC members to be published on project website.</p>
<p>2. Overview of Futureye Conclusions NB outlined that AGL were aware that they needed to improve how they engaged with the community and had engaged Futureye to assist with community engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Futureye spoke with and met some members of the community and following this made some recommendations about how AGL could improve the way they engaged with the community.</li> <li>• One of the recommendations was for AGL to improve in-house resources for community engagement and the second recommendation was for AGL to go out into the community and undertake appropriate consultation activities.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This CCC is an outcome of those recommendations. AGL is also currently in the process of appointing two new community relations members to the power development team.</li> <li>• NB outlined the key concerns that were identified by Futureye from their consultation with the community including health, noise, property values, trust and responsiveness, visual impact, fire and aviation and the community infrastructure classification and approval process.</li> <li>• NB said that through the CCC process these issues and concerns will be discussed and addressed appropriately in future meetings.</li> <li>• NB explained that Futureye were employed for a few months only, and were not employed to facilitate the CCC.</li> <li>• GHD has credentials for facilitating these types of meetings and were recommended by other AGL colleagues working in other parts of the business.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>3. Discussion of draft noise expert criteria and nominations</p> <p>BC reviewed the draft noise expert criteria that had been distributed to the CCC members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question from CCC - what the differences were between the noise report distributed last week and the original noise report.</li> <li>• The CCC was asked if there was any criteria missing from the draft criteria prepared. Suggested that there needs to be an expert in noise acceptable to QLD regulatory agencies and that they have knowledge of QLD noise legislation.</li> <li>• Nominations presented by AGL included: Dr Stephen Chiles; Dr Peter Teague and Malcolm Hayes.</li> <li>• Other nominations were called for from the CCC members. Stephen Cooper was suggested. Stephen Cooper did not fit criteria as he was retained by the Waubra Foundation.</li> <li>• Les Huson was suggested. He does not meet criteria as has represented an opponent of wind farms.</li> <li>• The CCC agreed that the technical author of the draft acoustic noise report present the report to the CCC before an independent noise expert be appointed, to provide the opportunity for the author to comment on the report.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: AGL to identify the differences in the report and providing a summary of this to CCC members.</p> <p>Action: Update draft noise criteria to include experience in Queensland noise legislation.</p> <p>Action: AGL to invite technical author of the noise report to attend July meeting.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The author of the report will be asked to explain the methodology used and how he came to reach his conclusions. The CCC members will have the opportunity to raise concerns about the report, identify gaps and if these cannot be answered at the next meeting then they will be identified and responded to at a following meeting.</li> <li>• At the conclusion of the July meeting, the CCC may agree an independent noise expert, ask for the noise report to be reviewed by this expert and this expert could then present the findings to the CCC.</li> <li>• A comment was made with respect to the noise you cannot hear and the potential health impacts this noise has. It was agreed that health will be addressed at a separate CCC meeting.</li> <li>• A comment was made about the equity in people getting compensated and others who are not. It was felt that people who have turbines on their property on existing wind farms do not complain for fear of litigation.</li> <li>• NB refuted this claim, along with several of the landowner CCC members. NB commented that a court of law would never uphold a gag clause in a contract. NB explained he had testified at a senate inquiry into wind farms that these clauses were not used by AGL. Other developers at the inquiry made the same statement.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: independent expert to be nominated and invited to attend the August meeting if required following the July meeting.</p>
<p>4. Discussion about operation of the CCC and chair of meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue raised by wind farm supporters being shouted down by other community members who oppose the development.</li> <li>• Issue raised regarding emails being distributed to some members of the CCC however not all members have email access and where possible AGL wants to ensure the CCC process remains transparent for all members.</li> <li>• One member had also spoken to the ABC radio about the draft noise report that had been issued to members for discussion at the forthcoming meeting. While claiming that his view did not represent the CCC other members felt that this went against the spirit of the terms of reference. It was agreed that any public comment on issued documentation prior to CCC discussion would not be acceptable.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Action: Members to refrain from speaking to the media prior to discussion of documents.</p> <p>Action: Members to refrain from speaking to the media on behalf of the CCC.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was suggested that Barbara Company facilitate the next meeting and in the mean time some draft criteria for an independent Chair be developed.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: Members to develop some preferred criteria and issue to BC to compile for further discussion with the CCC.</p>
<p>5. Discussion of noise legislation, policy and criteria EC provided an overview of the noise legislation and policy in QLD including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (Qld)</li> <li>Environmental Protection Act 1994</li> <li>Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 2008</li> <li>A brief discussion regarding the character and nature of noise of a wind farm being different to that of other industrial developments which produce a constant and continuous source of noise.</li> <li>Issue raised regarding wind speed variation affecting noise and the noise modelling used to determine how wind may mask noise. EC explained that the noise expert would be able to advise further on these issues at the next meeting.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>6. Other comments Visual amenity was a concern raised by one observer. NB explained that the impact of visual amenity can be addressed technically through modelling and screening where appropriate. Reflections can be managed by the paint applied. People will be able to see these structures and everyone will have a different opinion about how they look. Visual amenity is one of the issues to be addressed through the CCC.</p>	
<p>7. Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The noise consultant author of the draft Acoustic Report will attend the next meeting to present the report.</li> <li>Following the next meeting, an independent noise expert may be appointed to present at the August meeting should the CCC request this.</li> <li>Draft criteria for the independent chair to be compiled for further discussion at the CCC..</li> <li>Once the criteria is agreed by the CCC an advertisement will be placed in the Courier Mail, Dalby Herald and South Burnett Times.</li> <li>Next meeting will be at 2pm on Thursday 19 July at the Cooranga North Community Hall.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: AGL to invite the author to attend the July meeting.</p>
<p>8. Meeting closed at approximately 12.30pm</p>	

