



Project:	Coopers Gap Wind Farm
Meeting No:	Fifth Community Consultative Committee meeting
Date:	Thursday 20 September 2012
Venue and Time:	Cooranga North Community Hall 1pm – 4.00pm
Document:	Meeting notes and actions
Chair/Facilitator:	Kath Elliott (KE), GHD
Minutes:	Sara van der Schatte Olivier (SO), GHD
AGL representatives:	Nigel Bean (NB) Project Director and Amanda Shaw (AS) Community Engagement Manager

Committee Members:	Ian Schafferis	Participating landowner
	Sue Sinammon	Participating landowner
	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:	Bryan Lyons
Bruce Gooderham		Neighbour
Rod Kane		Neighbour
Jacqui Castle		Neighbour
Jane Holdsworth		Western Downs Regional Council
Evan Carless		AGL. Amanda Shaw, Community Engagement Manager in attendance.
Community observers in attendance:	Approximately 6	

- > 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) welcomed the CCC members and observers in attendance and provided an overview of the agenda. A late apology was noted from the representative from Queensland Fire and Rescue. The fire risk management section of the agenda was postponed to a later meeting.</p> <p>The minutes from the August meeting were discussed and adopted with no changes required.</p> <p>KE noted apologies of CCC members and advised that AGL had received a letter from Mayor Kratzmann advising that the Concerned Citizens Group was no longer going to participate in the CCC.</p>	
<p>Committee members wished to discuss the letter that was sent out by Mayor Wayne Kratzmann of South Burnett Regional Council to AGL on 14 September. This letter detailed the concerns raised by the Cooranga North Concerned Citizens Group in relation to the consultation process and subsequently why the group representatives would not be participating in the CCC moving forward. The contents of letter were read out to the group.</p> <p>Nigel Bean explained that they would be providing a response to the Mayor. He noted AGL was disappointed that some members had decided to withdraw from the group as they were trying to make this process as inclusive as possible. Nigel advised they would be in contact with those members who had withdrawn to see any reasonable steps could be taken to address their concerns and encourage them to re-engage in the process.</p> <p>The members in attendance expressed that they would like to be consulted with prior to any changes to the terms of reference being considered based on feedback from the Concerned Citizens Group.</p> <p>Members in attendance discussed that it was important that an offer be extended to other neighbours who may want to participate and fill any available spaces. The group discussed that the new positions should be offered to members of the local community and not turbine host owners or members of the Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters group to ensure accurate representation.</p>	<p>AGL to provide a response to Mayor Wayne Kratzmann</p>

<p>It was noted by Nigel that AGL needed to first liaise with those members who were not in attendance to formally confirm they have resigned. <u>If notice is given that members would like to formally resign from the CCC then letters will be sent to those members from AGL confirming and accepting their resignation.</u></p> <p>It was noted that technical presentations are now being made available on the website so those members of the community who do not attend the meetings can still receive the information presented.</p>	<p>AGL to follow up with Concerned Citizen spokesperson and Neighbours to clarify if they have formally resigned from committee.</p>
<p>The members in attendance addressed each point raised in the letter from the Mayor about why some members were critical of the process and had withdrawn from the CCC. The members in attendance rejected all claims made in the letter.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Lack of an independent facilitator</i> – the Terms of Reference state that AGL will appoint an appropriate Chair to facilitate the meeting. The Terms of Reference were provided to all members, and agreed upon by all members, at the start of the process. 2. <i>Minutes of the meeting not being a true record of discussion</i> – whilst the notes taken are not verbatim, the members in attendance felt they reflected the discussion and actions agreed during each of the meetings. The members also commented that at the start of each meeting, members have the opportunity to request for changes to the meeting minutes to be made if they felt discussions had not been captured correctly. This process is also included in the Terms of Reference. 3. <i>Concerned Citizens spokesperson being restricted by the facilitator</i> – The members in attendance felt that the spokesperson for the Concerned Citizens group had been given more opportunity to speak and ask questions than any other member on the committee. 	

4. *Independent experts are not being authorised to be a part of the process* – The members in attendance noted the group was previously asked if they had any independent experts they wanted to nominate to present at the meetings so that the group could ask questions. It was noted that the spokesperson for the Concerned Citizens Group had recommended some speakers however they were not independent and therefore not considered by AGL as appropriate to attend.
Nigel Bean reiterated at this meeting that he was willing to fund an independent expert to present to the group who could demonstrate objectivity however he was not willing to fund a speaker who was biased or who took an adversarial position towards wind farm developments.
5. *Meetings are not structured nor conform with normal CCC meeting procedures* – The members in attendance felt the meetings proceeded according to the Terms of Reference which were previously agreed to by the members. Nigel Bean advised that there is no “one size fits all” approach to CCC’s and the Terms of Reference were evolving to ensure they met the needs of the group. A number of revisions to the Terms of Reference have already been made throughout the process and will continue to be made as required.
6. *Inclusion of ‘Turbine hosts’ on the committee* – the nominated groups for inclusion on the CCC were discussed and agreed at the first meeting. A comment was made by a member that ‘Turbine hosts’ are also rate paying members of the community who have an interest in the development and process.
7. *Attendees who are not committee members have limited opportunity for input* – The committee members in attendance commented that the Terms of Reference state that CCC members should be consulting with the groups they represent and bring forward the concerns and questions of their respective groups to the meeting. Additionally, each meeting agenda has allowed for questions from the floor if time permits.



<p>It was noted by the South Burnett Regional Council representative on the CCC, Chris Du Plessis, that despite the letter from the Mayor of South Burnett, he would continue to participate on behalf of Council.</p>	
<p>The Committee members in attendance asked that a letter be prepared and sent back to the Mayor and those CC'd in the Mayor's letter to AGL. Members in attendance agreed that they would like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CCC meetings to continue as they were educational and were open for all community members to attend. • The meetings to be held in other locations so the broader public could come and hear more about the proposed development • Any vacancies on the committee to be filled by non-turbine hosts and not members of the Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters group to ensure a balance of views on the committee. 	<p>KE to prepare draft response to Mayor Kratzmann from CCC members in attendance based on discussion. Members in attendance to review, make any changes they would like, and send on as they see appropriate.</p>
<p>Mal Collinge arrived at 1.40pm</p> <p>KE and the committee members in attendance provided an update on the discussions so far.</p> <p>It was noted by a community member that they would like to see the best possible outcomes for all involved so everyone benefits from the development.</p> <p>AGL commented that the purpose of the CCC was to communicate with the community, provide information, answer questions, listen to the community's concerns and to try for the best possible outcomes.</p>	

<p>One member commented that they supported development but would like AGL to review the location of some of the proposed turbines to try and minimise community concern related to noise. In response, one member reminded the group about the earlier noise presentation and reiterated the importance of the noise targets instead of implementing a buffer zone to ensure the noise levels associated with the proposed wind farm were acceptable.</p> <p>Nigel Bean advised AGL would be happy to discuss the location of the turbines and what opportunities are available with any concerned community members. He reminded the group the proposed wind farm initially proposed 252 turbines however since AGL took over the development the number of proposed turbines has been reduced to 115. He stated it was important to provide information about noise to the community to try and build more understanding on this matter. He noted Rhys Brown from Aecom will be presenting information on noise to both Councils.</p>	
<p>Summary of Questions from Noise Catch Up Session:</p> <p>During the noise presentation catch up session that was held prior to this meeting, clarification from a member was sought about what the 'worst case wind direction' represented for compliance monitoring. It was explained that the 'worst case' wind direction represents the cardinal direction from the nearest turbine to a house. I.e. the measurements taken to confirm compliance with noise criteria only look at the worst case wind scenario where the turbines have the most impact on noise levels at a house. It was also stated that the 'worst case wind direction' is used to quantify the highest impact from the wind farm and does not necessarily cause the highest overall noise level at a house as wind from other directions may cause higher noise levels due to localised noise generated by this wind.</p>	

2. Presentation on shadow flicker, Trenton Gilbert, Senior Engineer at GL Garrad Hassan

Trenton Gilbert presented information on shadow flicker (presentation slides available online).

Questions asked during the presentation:

Q1. What is the longest length of shadow that may be caused by the wind turbines?

A1. The further away from the turbine you get the more the shadow diffuses however by about 1km away from the turbine the shadow is diffused.

Q2. Are there any houses within 1km of a turbine?

A2. There are only participating landowners within 1km of the turbine.

Q3. What is diffusion?

A3. When the edges of a shadow have no distinct edge – it can be caused by light being refracted or scattered off aerosols or dust or other particles on the air.

Q4. If you are north or south of the turbine is the intensity of the shadow less?

A4. Yes, the most pronounced shadow is in the east or west during the morning and evening.

Q5. How frequent will the flicker be?

A5. The flicker frequency will be about every one second.

Q6. How does flicker affect people's vision?

A6. There are a large number of people who live and work around wind farms and there is no evidence available to suggest any damage to people's vision. The flicker affect is similar to when you drive along a road that is lined with an avenue of trees and the light flickers in between each tree but this is not a regular flicker. Shadow flicker is noticed indoors more than outdoors as there are more light sources outdoors that would reduce the impact of shadow flicker.

Q7. What compliance criteria must you adhere to for shadow flicker?

A7. The project must comply with limits to shadow flicker durations. Non-participating landowners must not be affected by more than 30 hours of shadow flicker in one year. This equates to approximately half an hour a day for two months a year as a worst case scenario.

3. Presentation on electromagnetic interference,
Trenton Gilbert, GL Garrad Hassan

Trenton presented information on electromagnetic interference (presentation slides available online).

Questions asked during the presentation:

Q1. What frequency range do mobile phones operate in?

A1. Around 800-2000 MHZ.

Q2. Emergency services use UHF and HF to transmit radio signals. Could the wind farm cause any interference to their ability to transmit and receive signals?

A2. As part of the assessment process consultation has been undertaken with emergency services. This has included reviewing their assets including radio base stations. Don't believe there will be any interference with UHF signal transmission. The emergency services were not concerned.

Q3. How do gliders know to avoid wind turbines?

A3. AGL will have an obligation to notify the Air Services Council which will chart the location of wind turbines.

Q4. If landowners experience a change in television reception after the construction of the wind turbine would AGL fix the problem?

A4. Yes, AGL would make good any impact the wind farm has on television reception. AGL has provided satellite televisions to landowners around other wind farms.

Q5. If Telstra were to build a radio tower after the wind farm was constructed would they need to work around the wind farm?

A5. Yes, if the wind farm was constructed first they would need to work around it.

<p>4. Correspondence received by AGL, Nigel Bean presented responses to correspondence</p> <p>Community correspondence received by AGL since the last meeting and the associated responses were provided in a presentation (available online).</p> <p>As discussed at the previous meeting, it was agreed that an agenda item would be added to future meetings to allow any community enquires/concerns raised between meetings to be discussed at the next CCC meeting. This would give everyone an opportunity to receive the same information.</p> <p>It was noted that only correspondence about matters that are likely to be relevant to all community members will be discussed at the meeting. If a community member raises an item specific to them, it would not be included on the agenda.</p>	
<p>5. Discussion of next meeting objectives</p> <p>The CCC members in attendance discussed the logistics for the October meeting. It was agreed that health was a large enough topic to cover in this meeting on its own and no other agenda items were required.</p> <p>It was agreed that the meeting would be held at Western Downs Regional Council in Dalby on 18 October between 1pm -4pm if Council had a suitable room available.</p> <p>AGL confirmed it would schedule a bus to pick up interested community members from Kingaroy, Cooranga North and Bell and transport them to and from Dalby for the meeting.</p> <p>The group discussed potential topics for the November CCC meeting including flora and fauna, fire risk management, environmental management (in particular management procedures to prevent the spread of weeds) and a presentation from the Clean Energy Council (CEC). It was mentioned by some members that they would like to hear more about the benefits of the project to the local area. AGL advised they would investigate the availability of a representative from the CEC to attend the November meeting and book them in if available.</p>	<p>AGL to investigate availability of a representative from the CEC to come and present to the group in November and book if available.</p>
<p>Other business</p> <p>It was noted that the committee had requested at the August CCC meeting to have community feedback forms available so that observers of the meetings could write down any comments or queries they would like to have addressed during the meetings. These feedback forms were provided and a submission box was placed at the back of the room. These will continue to be provided at each meeting.</p>	



<p>It was noted that the Terms of Reference had been updated in accordance with the decision to do so at the August meeting. The Terms of Reference now state that members can nominate one alternate if they are unavailable to attend a meeting.</p>	
<p>A question was asked about whether AGL would consider taking the CCC members to visit another wind farm.</p> <p>Nigel Bean agreed to take the CCC members to visit a wind farm. Depending on the level of interest it was noted that AGL may consider taking a few additional community members on the visit.</p>	<p>AGL to gauge interest in a wind farm visit and confirm availability and potential dates.</p>
<p>Meeting closed at 4pm.</p>	