



Item		Action
1.	Welcome BC opened the meeting, welcomed the committee members and the community observers and outlined the agenda, including stating that there would be an opportunity for observers to participate and ask questions at a later stage in the meeting.	Noted

Coopers Gap CCC meeting minutes 19 July 2012

AGL is taking action toward creating a sustainable energy future for our investors, communities and customers. Key actions are:

Being Australias 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





- BC advised that the first item was to read and adopt the minutes.
- Bryan Lyons raised the following issues concerning minutes: he felt they should be a more accurate record stating what individuals said, that the government would be reading them and that he represented people who could not attend and he wanted them to be more reflective of discussion.
- Discussion took place about the way the minutes would be written.
- Bryan tabled Mt Arthur Coal CC meeting minutes which is a mandatory committee.
- It was noted that the Coopers Gap committee is part of a voluntary process established by AGL to provide more open and transparent communications between the company and the community on the wind farm project.
- The committee agreed that the June minutes would not be adopted at the meeting. The committee would provide feedback on the June minutes together with the July minutes (once written and distributed) and provide feedback on June minutes in one week and feedback on July minutes within 14 days. Both sets of minutes would be discussed and endorsed (with any amendments) at the August meeting.
- It was agreed that in future members would raise issues in the 14 day window to reduce the time spent at meetigs which could be used for other discussion.
- It was noted that Mal Collinge had been appointed at the June committee meeting, which was outside the process contained in the terms of reference. AGL requested the committee's concurrence with this appointment and the committee agreed it was appropriate and reiterated its welcome to Mal.
- Margaret O'Brien advised that she would like to resign as she did not have the time to devote to the committee. She advised that she would like to see Jacqui Castle replace her on the committee.
- The committee discussed appointing Jacqui and agreed this was appropriate.
- BC thanked Margaret on behalf of the committee, who left the table.
- BC welcomed Jacqui to the committee who joined the table.

Action: Meeting minutes procedure to be changed in the terms of reference.



2.	Presentation by Rhys Brown, Noise consultant, AECOM.	Noted
	 BC introduced Rhys Brown, the lead author of the noise and vibration section of the environmental assessment. Rhys Brown presented his report outlining the methodology, potential impacts and mitigation. 	
3.	Facilitated discussion of draft noise report At the conclusion of the presentation Rhys answered a number of questions from the committee as follows:	Action: AECOM presentation to be provided to CCC members.
		Action: noise to be put on the agenda for the August meeting
	Q1. There are currently no noise guidelines in Queensland. What happens to the noise levels on the windfarm project when QLD has them? A: Depending on when QLD guidelines for wind farms may be issued by the government, the project would look to adopt these for the assessment of Coopers Gap Q2: Graph (r,g,b) – is that using range – worst case? A: Blue line is the forecast noise level as a result of modelling. Conservative assumptions are used during the modelling process. Green line is the measured background noise level meausred at this location Red line is the noise criteria derived from the background noise levels compare with windfarms in other areas – is it noisier? A: Background noise levels are measured here – no comparisons have been made. Q4: How accurate is modelling? A: The assumptions used in the noise modelling are conservative and are outlined in the report. The modelling methodology has been validated through noise measuremnts at other wind farm sites in Australia.	



Q5: Are there problems with AGL's modelling. E.g. noise modelling at Hallet Hill

A: At Hallet Hill the supplied equipment was faulty, and has been rectified to meet guarantee. Its not a modelling issue.

Q6: What if in practice the noise levels are different to modelling?

A: The operator of the wind farm would be required to comply with its license conditions, which would include noise limits. This would be based on measurements and not the outcomes of the modelling.

Q7: Is tonality covered off in the report – has tonality been allowed for?

A: We have proposed to use criteria for tonality currently used by the SA EPA which is more stringent than the current version of the New Zealand Standard (NZS6808:2010). Future environmental conditions for the project will impose conditions to be met on tonality. Tonality levels often form part of contractural agreements that turbine suppliers enter into.

Q8: What if AGL does not comply with the tonality noise conditions?

A: There will be a 5dba penalty and the wind farm would likely be in exceedance of its conditions and rectification would need to be undertaken.

Q9: Does noise impact change the further you are away?

A: Yes, it is less.

Q10: Does terrain make a difference such as hills, and do trees reduce noise? This is the type of terrain we have here.

A: Yes, it does and the modelling was done at a number of relevant locations in the area including hilly and treed areas.

Q11: How did the background noise monitoring take place and was it done near residences?

A: Yes at residences and we followed guidelines which stipulate distances from residences and trees and shrubs etc.



Q12: What times did you model?

A: All time periods, including at night.

Q13: Why have you not used QLD noise policy?

A: Because wind farms only generate noise when the wind is blowing at sufficient speeds, they are assessed using dedicated guidelines and policies that take wind speed variation into account. Queensland does not have wind farm guidelines. Accordingly SA guidelines have been adopted. The report references QLD legislation and guidelines and shows that where they can be compared, the assessment is comparable. Q14: Can it have varied noisiness and be noisy but still

comply? (average method)

A: The influence of wind noise and that the noise emission is not constant, unlike steady state industry, a more appropriate methodology of measuring compliance is required. The report proposes the methodology outlined in SA2009 which is consistent with the methodology in Australian Standard AS4959. The methodology used in these documents provides an accurate representation of the wind farm noise and is the only method to measure wind farm noise emission in a windy environment.

Q15: Do you measure at hub and receptor?

A: Yes, both. Noise is always measured at the receptor. Wind speed is measured at the hub height for the correlation of wind speed at the hub height and background noise level at the receptor. Wind speed has also been measured at the receptor to ensure that wind noise over the microphone has not artificially raised the measured background noise levels.

Q16: Is modelling based on fieldwork at receptors – or on computer?

A: We validated the modelling method at existing wind farm sites.

Q17: We would like to request attenuation testing on houses.

A: AGL will consider it.

Q18: We want more discussions on noise.

A. Next meeting will have a health expert but noise is a key part of this so we can include noise as well.

Q19: Where were receptors - up or down wind?

A: It depends on the location of the nearest turbines.



Q20: What are the noise impacts on bats, fauna?

A: Rhys advised he was not a wildlife expert but that there was a chapter on wildlife.

Q21: Aware of last wind farm approved in QLD?

A: No

Q22: Is your modelling modelling based on a 112?

A: Yes

Q23: Does sound double at 10dba increase?

A: The perception of it does.

Q24: Did you consider cumulative impacts?

A: Yes we considered cumulative impact.

Q25: Is it noisier in a valley because we have some valleys where you are proposing to put these turbines?

A: The modelling takes into account this type of topography

Q26: Are farmer workers protected from noise?

A: Yes, under OHS legislation.

Q27: Will towers be fully monitored?

A: The wind farm will have conditions which will stipulate post commission monitoring.

Q28: Our house will get 40dba night. Can we get it down 30dba?

A: The outdoor noise level of 40 dB(A) is appropriate based on the night time acoustic quality objective of 30 dB(A) indoors and when applying a typical reduction of 10 dB across a façade containing an open or partially open window.

Q29: If they don't comply – will AGL turn them off, fix them up, and if that fails pull them down?

A. AGL will take this on notice and wishes to talk about these types of issues in the CCC meetings.



Questions from community observers

Q1: NSW has a 35dba noise guideline? Why can't we have that in our quiet area.

A: AGL advised they will take that on board for consideration.

Q2: Can we model 35 DBA?

A: AGL will take that on notice.

Q3: When will you submit?

A: AGL advised, expected time frame is towards the end of the year all being well.

Q4: The Qld policy may be introduced by the end of the year – will you wait for QLD policy?

A: AGL advised, it is not known exactly when the Old noise policy will be introduced so AGL will not be waiting however we have taken on board that people are seeking to reduce the noise limit to 35dba and will consider this request. If 35dBA becomes the noise criteria under which this project is assessed then AGL will adapt to comply with this requirement.

Q5: Is that draft report reissued? Who to and how? I submitted comments and I did not get it and I had to find it on the web. It would be good if people who submit are provided with the report.

A: The report was provided to the CCC. It is an interim/updated report not a Revised Assessment Report (RAR). We acknowledge that submitters would like it and we will take that on board.

Q6: Would it be prudent to utilise NSW/VIC contemporary guidelines as they are lower.

A: SA guidelines are most advanced at the time of writing the report and are shown in the report to be consistent with Queensland legislation and guidelines where applicable.



- 4. Other matters including role of the facilitator and meeting frequency and timing
 - The committee discussed the frequency and timing of meetings and it was agreed that the meetings would be held for three hours between 1pm and 4pm on a monthly basis to get through the agenda and have time for discussion.
 - It was noted that two hours was too limited to allow for adequate discussion of the issues.
 - It was agreed that members who had numbers of questions would submit these to AGL with their comments on the minutes.
 - These questions on notice would be better able to be addressed by AGL.
 - It was noted that there would still be the opportunity for spontaneous questions as part of the committee discussions.
 - It was noted that AGL had committed to advertising for an independent chair /facilitator for the CCC at the June meeting and some members were disappointed this had not happened.
 - There was discussion about the independence of the facilitator/chair and it was also noted by some committee members that the Terms of reference say that AGL would appoint a facilitator and that the committee members signed up to the Terms of reference.
 - AGL reiterated its original position of appointing the facilitator and would not be advertising for an independent facilitator.
 - AGL requested people to talk to AGL if they had any issues with BC as chair.

Action: committee members to submit questions to AGL prior to meetings

Action: AGL to revise agenda to extend meeting to three hours



5. Other comments

- BC advised that she would be on leave and would be unable to facilitate the next two meetings and that Kath Elliott of GHD would facilitate the August and September meetings.
- Committee members said that while they learned about the project from the meetings they wanted to know what AGL got out of the meetings.
- AGL advised that the July meeting had highlighted four important issues for AGL 1. That if AGL exceeds its noise limits then the community wanted AGL to shut down, fix the turbines and if this didn't work, remove the turbines.2. The Cooranga North Concerned Citizens representative would like AGL to consider lowering the noise limits to 35 dba. 3.The Concerned Citizens representative would like AGL to commission attenuation measurements at the facades of residences and 4. More information was needed on the averaging period for noise monitoring.
- A question was raised from the community observers about the recommendations from Future Eye.
- NB advised that Future Eye were no longer engaged by AGL and that AGL was working more closely with the community and wanted to engage transparently and work together to get the best outcomes.

6. Next meetingtcomes

- The committee agreed that they would like to talk about health and noise at the next meeting.
 AGL will invite a health expert to the next meeting.
- Next meeting will be at 1pm on Thursday 16
 August at the Cooranga North Community Hall.

Action: AGL to invite health expert to attend the August meeting.

Action: AGL to invite Rhys to attend the August meeting.

Meeting closed at approximately 4.15pm