T: 02 9921 2999 F: 02 9921 2552 www.agl.com.au

## Energy in action.<sup>®</sup>

Project:	Coopers Gap Wind Farm
Meeting No:	9
Date:	Thursday 21 February 2013
Venue and Time:	Bell Bunya Community Centre
Document:	Meeting notes and actions
Chair/Facilitator:	Kath Elliott, (KE), GHD
Minutes:	Rosa Han (RH), AGL
AGL representatives:	Evan Carless (EC) Project Manager
	Amanda Shaw (AS) Community Engagement Manager
Committee Members:	Ian Schafferius, Participating landowner
	Sue Sinnamon, Participating landowner
	Tom Hoare, Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters
	Cyril Stewart, Coopers Gap Wind Farm Supporters
	Ashley Perkins (in place of Jane Holdsworth), Western Downs Regional Council
	Chris Du Plessis, South Burnett Regional Council
	Neil French, Neighbour
	Mick Cosgrove, Neighbour
	Tony Brame, Economic Development and Tourism for WDRC
Apologies:	Mal Collinge, Local Aboriginal Elder
	Gregory Taffe, Kingaroy Chamber of Commerce
Community observers in attendance:	Approximately 5

**MAGL** 

## Coopers Gap CCC meeting minutes 21 February 2013

- 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

## **Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Minutes	
Item	Action
1. Welcome	
Kath Elliott (KE) welcomed the CCC members and observers in attendance.	
KE discussed the agenda with the committee.	
The minutes from the January 2013 meeting were discussed and adopted with no changes required.	
2. Benefits to community and local businesses and how AGL can best engage with local business, Evan Carless (EC)	
Refer to presentation slides 3-11.	
EC noted that he believed it was worthwhile discussing the economic investment made during the construction and operational stages of other AGL wind farms to get a better understanding of the potential economic benefits for this project.	
He explained that consultants SKM had completed an economic impact assessment of the following AGL wind farms:	
<ol> <li>Hallett Wind Farms, SA</li> <li>Oaklands Hill Wind Farm, VIC</li> <li>and Macarthur Wind Farm, VIC</li> </ol>	
The findings of these assessments were presented in two separate reports; a South Australia report and a Victoria report.	
To prepare these reports, SKM collected data from AGL and its contractors in the form of questionnaires and a review of expenditure data.	
EC noted at the time of the Victoria report being prepared, Oaklands Hill Wind Farm was operating and construction was underway at the Macarthur Wind Farm. As such, the data presented in the survey was relevant to that time period and also included a projection of future benefits.	
EC noted that the Hallett Wind Farms combined would be a similar size to what is proposed for the Coopers Gap Wind Farm. The Oaklands Hill Wind Farm is considerably smaller and the Macarthur Wind Farm is about 20% larger.	
	I

)》AGL

ৠAGL

Q1. What do you class as 'local'?A2. For the Hallett report, 'local' was considered the three Council areas detailed in slide four of the presentation. The wind farms are located in two of these three Council areas. For Coopers Gap, 'local' would be considered the areas of Western Downs Regional Council and South Burnett Regional Council.EC noted the reason why there were greater benefits in Macarthur compared to the Hallett region was due to the industrial capabilities near the Macarthur Wind Farm which resulted in greater regional spend.Q2. How does the Hallett and Macarthur regions compare to the Coopers Gap region?A2. This region would be somewhere in the middle. There will most likely be greater benefits when compared to Hallett but not as much as Macarthur.Q3. Is this dollar figure a consecutive figure or over a certain period?A3. This is the figure over the life of the project. The life of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to Macarthur.EC explained that there was no data on the economic benefits associated with the operating for 6 months when the assessment was conducted.EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.AGL to upload reports to the Coopers Gap website	-	
<ul> <li>three Council areas detailed in slide four of the presentation. The wind farms are located in two of these three Council areas. For Coopers Gap, 'local' would be considered the areas of Western Downs Regional Council and South Burnett Regional Council.</li> <li>EC noted the reason why there were greater benefits in Macarthur compared to the Hallett region was due to the industrial capabilities near the Macarthur Wind Farm which resulted in greater regional spend.</li> <li>Q2. How does the Hallett and Macarthur regions compare to the Coopers Gap region?</li> <li>A2. This region would be somewhere in the middle. There will most likely be greater benefits when compared to Hallett but not as much as Macarthur.</li> <li>Q3. Is this dollar figure a consecutive figure or over a certain period?</li> <li>A3. This is the figure over the life of the project. The life of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to Macarthur.</li> <li>EC explained that there was no data on the economic benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur.</li> <li>EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.</li> </ul>	Q1. What do you class as 'local'?	
Macarthur compared to the Hallett region was due to the industrial capabilities near the Macarthur Wind Farm which resulted in greater regional spend.Q2. How does the Hallett and Macarthur regions compare to the Coopers Gap region?A2. This region would be somewhere in the middle. There will most likely be greater benefits when compared to Hallett but not as much as Macarthur.Q3. Is this dollar figure a consecutive figure or over a certain period?A3. This is the figure over the life of the project. The life of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to Macarthur.EC explained that there was no data on the economic benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur as construction was still underway. He also noted Oaklands had only been operating for 6 months when the assessment was conducted.EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.	three Council areas detailed in slide four of the presentation. The wind farms are located in two of these three Council areas. For Coopers Gap, 'local' would be considered the areas of Western Downs Regional	
<ul> <li>compare to the Coopers Gap region?</li> <li>A2. This region would be somewhere in the middle. There will most likely be greater benefits when compared to Hallett but not as much as Macarthur.</li> <li>Q3. Is this dollar figure a consecutive figure or over a certain period?</li> <li>A3. This is the figure over the life of the project. The life of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to Macarthur.</li> <li>EC explained that there was no data on the economic benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur as construction was still underway. He also noted Oaklands had only been operating for 6 months when the assessment was conducted.</li> <li>EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.</li> </ul>	Macarthur compared to the Hallett region was due to the industrial capabilities near the Macarthur Wind Farm	
There will most likely be greater benefits when compared to Hallett but not as much as Macarthur. Q3. Is this dollar figure a consecutive figure or over a certain period? A3. This is the figure over the life of the project. The life of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to Macarthur. EC explained that there was no data on the economic benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur as construction was still underway. He also noted Oaklands had only been operating for 6 months when the assessment was conducted. EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study. AGL to upload reports to the Coopers Gap website		
<ul> <li>certain period?</li> <li>A3. This is the figure over the life of the project. The life of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to Macarthur.</li> <li>EC explained that there was no data on the economic benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur as construction was still underway. He also noted Oaklands had only been operating for 6 months when the assessment was conducted.</li> <li>EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.</li> </ul>	There will most likely be greater benefits when	
<ul> <li>of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to Macarthur.</li> <li>EC explained that there was no data on the economic benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur as construction was still underway. He also noted Oaklands had only been operating for 6 months when the assessment was conducted.</li> <li>EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur as construction was still underway. He also noted Oaklands had only been operating for 6 months when the assessment was conducted.</li> <li>EC noted the report also looked at the employment benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.</li> <li>AGL to upload reports to the Coopers Gap website</li> </ul>	of the Hallett projects was 5 years whereas Macarthur was 2.5 years. EC explained that the Hallett projects were spread out over a longer period of time however the intensity of activity was less when compared to	
benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the Hallett study.	benefits associated with the operations stage for Macarthur as construction was still underway. He also noted Oaklands had only been operating for 6 months	
These two economic impact accomments will be	benefits in the local area however the Macarthur and Oaklands study was more comprehensive than the	reports to the Coopers Gap
uploaded to the Coopers Gap website shortly.	These two economic impact assessments will be uploaded to the Coopers Gap website shortly.	

Questions from CCC:

the loca	at procedures does AGL have in place to ensure al community know in a timely manner as to bs will be available and how they'll be available?	
key. AC build th this (in Macarth joint ve	advised a two way exchange of information is GL engages a 'turnkey' contractor whose role is to be wind farm and all other works associated with cluding sourcing resources.) For example, at the nur Wind Farm, Vestas and Leighton's were in a enture and it was their role to source the ent and resources.	
to tend Comme and the	Silverton Wind Farm, AGL has recently gone out er and has also engaged with Chamber of erce to provide a link between local businesses e project. The capabilities of local businesses in a were included in the tender documents.	
Q5. Wil	I the contractors have their own gear?	
Also, th	Macarthur, some of the gear was sourced locally. The figures from the assessment show that 31% of a did not relocate which means they were locals.	
	t AGL's policy that the turnkey contractor must locally?	
and to possible series of before busines as they past AC	it is not. However, it is AGL's policy to encourage facilitate the contractor to source locally where e. It is likely the turnkey contractor will hold a of information sessions approximately 6 months they commence construction to engage with local ses. Local businesses have a natural advantage have people and resources available locally. On GL projects there has been significant local ment and involvement of local business.	
-	es the economic assessment go into greater bout what types of jobs are actually required?	
the foc explore	e high level investment in the region has been us of the presentation today however AGL would what specific detailed information about jobs is le and report back to the CCC at a future g.	AGL to explore what specific information is available about
where t turnkey	ed often the Chamber of Commerce has a process they promote local businesses/suppliers to the contractor and asked both council reps if their ive council's can assist the project in a similar	jobs and provide further information to the CCC where possible.
place w themse can the	rame from WDRC stated that a process is in where local suppliers/ businesses register lves on the Council's online system. Contractors in contact WDRC if they are looking for certain tes and the council can then contact the relevant rs.	
Comme	ed as Greg Taffe from Kingaroy Chamber of erce is also a committee representative, it will be hile also discussing this further with Greg.	

ৠAGL

	1
Questions from observers:	
Q1. Does SBRC have a register similar to WDRC system?	
A1. There is a system available for local contractors.	
A discussion around the Community Fund ensued.	
AS noted that historically there has been community funds linked to wind farms and typically they commence at the construction stage and continue for the life of the project. AS advised it was AGL's intention to have a community fund for the Coopers Gap project however the value is yet to be confirmed. AS noted as an example, the value of the Hallett Community fund is approximately \$60k each year. She advised the value of the community fund is typically linked to the size of the wind farm. AS advised she would appreciate feedback from the committee in relation to how they thought the proposed Coppers Gap community fund could function to ensure it suited the needs of this specific community.	AS to distribute
AS provided a brief summary on how the Hallett community fund operates. She advised an ad is placed in the newspaper every year calling out for nominations. This provides applicants a timeframe to submit their application and AGL makes the final decision whilst liaising closely with councils.	AS to distribute an example community fund TOR to the CCC members
AS asked the CCC on their thoughts on how the fund will operate in the community. It was noted that various aspects of the fund will be up for discussion including the area it will cover and the eligibility criteria however the final decision would be with AGL.	
It was agreed that the CCC will discuss this further at the next CCC meeting.	
Q1. What are other AGL community funds used for?	
A1. The AGL community funds are distributed across a range of different parts of the community. Some examples include improvements to local schools and medical facilities.	
3. New nomination received for CCC, Amanda Shaw (AS)	
Mick Cosgrove left the room while discussions were taking place as he noted there was a conflict of interest with the nominee.	
AS noted that AGL had received a nomination from Andrew O'Conner to join to the committee.	
His nomination was discussed and no objection was raised by any present committee members in relation to Andrew's nomination.	

⊮AGL

A committee member noted that whilst in this instance he had no objection to one more member joining the committee, he believed it was important to remember that the committee should not grow too much larger to ensure it can continue to function smoothly.		
As such, AGL confirmed they were willing to accept Andrew's nomination.		
As there are now five new members who are relatively new to the committee, it was recommended that AGL invite Rhys Brown (Engineer, Acoustics) from AECOM to re-present the noise presentation to the new committee members. AGL confirmed they were willing to arrange for this to occur in the coming months subject to Rhy's availability.	AGL to provide update on Rhys' availability at next meeting	
4. Close and other business		
There was a discussion amongst the committee on how they can distribute information to the broader community.		
It was suggested that each CCC member could prepare a short profile about themselves and this information could be placed on the project website and circulated amongst the community.	AGL to liaise with all CCC members	
The proposed trip to an operating wind farm (Hallett, SA) was discussed. AS asked members to advise if they were interested in attending by the next meeting. She stated that places were limited and the focus was primarily for CCC members and landowners. One CCC member suggested it may be beneficial to invite a representative from the Concerned Citizens Group to this visit. AGL confirmed they would consider this suggestion.		
A potential venue for future meetings was discussed. Suggestions included the Jandowae Library, Kumbia Hall and the CWA Hall in Kumbia. It was noted that AGL would explore options available for the next meeting and provide details of the venue at the time of distributing the agenda.	RH to enquire bookings at suggested locations.	
	1	

It was also suggested that if the meeting is held in Jandowae, a letter box drop could be conducted prior to the meeting to raise awareness of the meeting being held. Also, a member noted that a local newspaper is also distributed in the area. Mick Cosgrove (MC) tabled a document on David Mortimer, a landowner at the Lake Bonney Wind Farm. EC provided some background information in regards to the situation with the landowner. EC noted that Infigen proposed to build a wind farm in Cherry Hill, VIC that this David presented at the VCAT Hearing. EC noted a transcript from the VCAT hearing will be publically available shortly. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, 21 March from 1pm to 4pm. Location is tentative for Jandowae Library. Meeting close.

≌AGI.