



Project:	Silverton Wind Farm
Meeting No:	Seventh Community Consultative Committee meeting
Date:	Thursday 23 May 2013
Venue and Time:	Silverton Youth Hall 6pm – 8pm
Document:	Meeting notes and actions
Chair/Facilitator:	Kath Elliott (KE)
Minutes:	Rosa Han (RH), AGL
AGL representatives:	Neil Cooke (NC) Manager, Power Development Nigel Bean (NB) Head of Generation Development Jeff Trompf (JT) Project Manager Nicole Rizgalla (NR) Media Adviser Frances Duffy (FD) Manager Community Engagement
Committee Members:	Cynthia Langford, Purnamoota Station
	Kevin White, Historic Daydream Mine
	Phillip Blore, Belmont Station
	Dennis Roach, Chamber of Commerce
	John Taplin, Secretary Silverton Village Committee
	Rod Grenfell, Local resident
	Peter Price, Silverton Committee/ Silverton Hotel
	Marion Browne, Councillor Broken Hill City Council
	Tiff Brown, Department of Primary Industries, Catchments & Lands
	Albert Woodroffe, Silverton Committee, Horizon Galleries
	Helen Murray, Local resident
Apologies	Dave Gallagher, Councillor Broken Hill City Council
	Maureen O'Donnell, Traditional Owner
	Joanne O'Donnell, Broken Hill Land Council
	Naomi Schmidt, Eldee Station
	Cameron Koch, Silver City Minerals
	Steve Radford, Consolidated Mining and Civil
Community observers in attendance:	Approximately 15 (Joe Sulicich from RMS also in attendance)

Meeting Minutes

Item	Action
<p>1. Welcome</p> <p>Kath Elliott (KE) opened the meeting at 6:00pm and welcomed members of the Silverton Community Consultative Committee (SCCC) and observers in attendance. She introduced the following guests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nigel Bean, Head of Generation Development, AGL • Nicole Rizgalla, Media, AGL • Jeff Trompf, Project Manager for Macarthur Wind Farm, AGL • Pauline Dunne, Regional Coordinator – Renewable Energy Precincts, Office of Environment and Heritage <p>KE also introduced Frances Duffy from AGL who is temporarily filling the position of Community Engagement Manager as Amanda Shaw has resigned.</p> <p>KE provided an overview of the agenda and noted that the presentation slides containing the potential turbine locations would not be uploaded on the project microsite due to commercial sensitivity.</p> <p>The minutes from the March 2013 meeting were discussed. A committee member stated that the previous minutes were not reflective of the negative comments made. She requested that the meeting minutes reflected the positive and negative aspects of the meeting in the future. The March minutes were adopted with no changes required.</p>	
<p>2. Project status update, Neil Cooke</p> <p>NC provided a project update to the committee. He noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 tenders received on 26 April 2013 • AGL is currently reviewing the tenders and it is expected that the 5 tenderers will be shortlisted to 2 tenderers by the June CCC meeting • It is expected that there will be approximately 2 months of negotiations with the final 2 tenderers • The final tenderer is expected to be announced in August 2013 • Return on Investment (ROI) is the main driver but community requirements would also be taken into consideration 	

Q1. Are you still on track with the date to announce the successful tenderer?

A1. NC answered that the process is on track with the schedule.

Q2. Have you received an offer to connect to the national grid yet?

A2. NC answered that it was expected for the offer to connect to come through towards the end of the year.

NC provided an update on the bypass from Broken Hill.

NC noted that the criteria that is being taken into consideration includes:

- Minimising the amount of materials coming onto the site
- Looking at transporting the materials from Port Adelaide and on the Barrier Highway through Daydream Mine Rd

The three options include:

1. Traffic coming through Broken Hill
2. Traffic coming through the bypass from Broken Hill
3. Traffic coming through the road opposite from Daydream Mine Rd

NC noted that the long bypass is not a well established track and AGL's view is that the short bypass is the preferred option to get materials from the Barrier Highway.

Comments from the committee:

Marion Browne (MB) made a comment that the council meeting that was held in relation to the proposed bypass was with the Willyama Common trustees. She noted there were concerns raised from councillors and from the public gallery and the main reason for the outcome was due to the lack of time to consider the proposal.

Peter Price (PP) added that he was not aware that the proposal had gone to the council. He noted the main hurdle would be getting the traffic onto Silverton Rd and the impact this would have on tourism in the area. He said that if the bypass is approved he would like to see another road constructed and commented that this could be done for minimal cost. PP said the community had spoken to a heavy load contractor who had concerns that the Silverton Rd could not sustain the heavy traffic.

Albert Woodroffe (AW) commented that after conversations with a logistics company who was involved in the Macarthur Wind Farm, he was advised that there would be:

- Over 500 movements one way carrying 3 parcels of towers
- The width of the low loader is 4.5m which means there will only be 800mm on either side of the Silverton Rd
- The low loaders would be travelling between 20-25km/hr

AW also noted that a business impact study was not included and he is concerned about the potential impact on tourism in the area. He also stated he was not against the project, however did have concerns with the impact that traffic will have on the community.

Jeff Trompf (JT) addressed the concerns raised by the committee members:

Volume of traffic:

- He noted that historically it was found that the biggest impacts on roads were from the construction materials being brought on to the site e.g. sand and rocks from quarries
- These trucks would put greater loads on the road and the main cause of road damage is due to the axle loading of the trucks and not the size of the trucks
- He noted that for the Silverton Wind Farm, a large portion of the materials is expected to be won on site which would reduce the volume of traffic on the roads

Types of traffic:

- JT confirmed that AW's figure for the width of the overdimensional loads was about right
- He also added that these loads don't have much axle loading on it so there is a lower potential that it would damage the roads
- These loads have front and rear controls and the hours they can operate within are restricted
- He noted that closer to the construction stage, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would be developed and it will specify what hours the trucks are allowed to operate within, which roads are to be used and the requirements around tourism traffic

- JT noted that there could be about 2-3 overdimensional loads per day and this would depend on the rate of construction.
- He confirmed the speed of the trucks will be 20-40km/hr in certain areas but he said that the time to get from Adelaide to Broken Hill would be about 8 – 10 hours, ie at a speed of about 60 km/ hr.

Questions:

Q1. What about the deterioration of the road due to the weight? The shoulders would need to be upgraded and maintained.

A1. JT answered that AGL is obliged to maintain and correct any damages caused as a result of the construction of the wind farm. NC noted that the maintenance fo the road is *during* as well as at the end of the construction period.

Q2. The 500 movements; is that moving the turbines? What about the other materials that has to come on site?

A2. JT answered that escort cars for overdimensional loads would be included in this figure, as well as cement trucks and maybe sand if it has to be brought in. He noted that it was an advantage that the bulk of the materials could be obtained on site.

Q3. What about the water for the batching plant?

A3. NC answered that the water is expected to come from the Umberumberka Reservoir, therefore additional water truck movements are not expected.

Q4. Will the committee be able to provide input into the TMP? And if it's not working can it be adjusted?

A4. JT answered that the successful tenderer and AGL are required to consult with the community in order for the TMP to receive approval by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. He noted that from his experiences, the TMP is very rigid and there are strict controls around the conditions laid out in the plan. He noted that once the plan is endorsed it cannot be changed.

Q5. We didn't know the bypass road was up for consultation. When will the TMP be done?

A5. NC explained that the project approval runs out on 24 May 2014 and the contractor will have to start writing the plan in October or November this year. NC added that the TMP would need to be approved by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. He noted there is about a 4 month period of writing and consulting and it will take about 2 months for the plan to be endorsed by the Department of Planning.

KE added that the CCC meetings provided an opportunity for the committee to have an input into the TMP.

<p>KE asked NC to explain why the proposal for the bypass was lodged with the Broken Hill Council recently, which seemed early in the process.</p> <p>NC explained that getting approvals can be a lengthy process and has the largest potential to hold up a project. He explained that once the agreements were made with the landowners, the next step was for approval from the Willyama Common trustees and Crown Lands.</p>	
<p>3. Potential turbine locations</p> <p>Note: the presentation slides containing each tenderer's proposed turbine locations have been removed from the presentation that is on the Silverton website.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>Q1. Can you specify the distance from the turbine to the nearest residence rather than kms from Silverton?</p> <p>A1. This information can be provided at the next meeting.</p> <p>Q2. How many turbines are within the various distances?</p> <p>A2. NC provided the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 turbine within 5km • 1 turbine within 5.5km • 1-4 turbines within 6km • 8 turbines within 6.5km <p>NC added that a key factor of determining the tenderers with whom we want to negotiate is the dollars per GWh (\$/GWh). This is calculated from the capital cost the tenderers put forward, divided by the electricity produced by their proposal.</p> <p>Q3. Have you decided to use the 3.1 megawatt turbines?</p> <p>A3. NC answered that the selected turbines will be between 2.5MW and 3.1MW.</p> <p>Q4. What have the tenderers done with the wind information that's been collected by AGL in respect to determining turbine locations?</p> <p>A4. NC explained that the tenderers have looked at the wind speed and the clustering of good wind speed sites as well as the constructability of the turbines.</p> <p>Q5. What criteria will you use to choose the tenderer?</p> <p>A5. NC answered that the key criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health, Safety & Environment • Internal Rate of Return (IRR) • Community feedback 	<p>NC to provide distances from the turbines to nearest residence</p>

Q6. Does the tenderer end up owning the site and AGL doesn't?

A6. NC answered that AGL will maintain control of the wind farm over its life from the point of view of energy being produced. It is expected that the turbine supplier will have a team that maintains the wind farm and an AGL Operations Manager will also be present.

NC added that whilst it is the responsibility of the tenderers to build the turbines, it is AGL's responsibility to engage with the community and the long term community manager will be responsible for this. AGL has an interest in building long term relationships with the community.

Q7. Where will the turbines be in relation to the Daydream Mine Rd?

A7. This information will be provided at the next meeting.

Q8. How many towers have the contractors come back with?

A8. NC answered there are between 83 and 104 turbines.

Q9. Will a higher level of noise be associated with the larger MW turbines? And what will be done to mitigate the noise and who will be responsible for the impact it will have on our health?

A9. NB explained that this wind farm will be AGL's asset which means it is the responsibility of AGL. He stated that there are 19 independent international studies which have rejected the claims of detrimental health effects from wind farms. In addition, reviews by the National Health and Medical Research Council, the recent Victorian Department of Health, fact sheets on wind farms and health provide further confirmation. He added that AGL is committed to investing a lot of money in an asset which will be operating for the next 25 years and this would not have been considered if it was something that could harm people. He encouraged the committee to watch the health presentation that Simon Chapman gave to the Coopers Gap CCC.

Helen Murray (HM) requested permission to table a document to the committee (the Washington University in St Louis School of Medicine – 6 publications written by 2 professors).

Half of the committee agreed for the document to be read out. KE read the letter to the meeting.

It was agreed that health is a topic of interest to most committee members and this should be discussed in detail at a future CCC meeting.

KE asked the committee if they were interested in hearing a presentation from Simon Chapman.

4 people (including observers) raised their hand.

NC to provide turbine distances from Daydream Mine at next meeting.

<p>It was agreed that a CD containing Simon Chapman’s presentation to the Coopers Gap CCC would be distributed to all CCC members and other interested community members before the next meeting. KE encouraged all to watch it to enable a productive discussion at the next meeting. The next steps will be decided at the June CCC meeting as a group.</p> <p>Comments from the committee:</p> <p>John Taplin commented that he is deaf and doesn’t wear a hearing aid but he can hear a humming noise. Health professionals have told him it’s impossible but he does hear it.</p> <p>AW commented on the stressful effect the prospect of the wind farm development had on his wife. He stated that his wife was an environmental advocate who died 3 years ago.</p> <p>HM stated that there are a lot of opposing views on wind farms in the public domain and there are always 2 sides to the story. She said the committee should inform themselves and would like the committee to support her as she is acting in their best interest.</p> <p>A comment was made by Kevin White (KW) that AGL should choose the tenderer who has proposed turbines the furthest away from Silverton.</p>	<p>RH to mail out CD to all CCC members and other interested community members.</p>
<p>4. Update on sourcing of sand from the Silverton Village Committee (SVC)</p> <p>John Taplin stated that the SVC was in favour of sand mining and they will support the licence application of sand mining. He added that once the contractor was decided they would like to meet with them to discuss royalties.</p> <p>NB added that there will also be a community fund set up for the life of the wind farm (25 years).</p> <p>HM added that there was a lot of community scepticism with the previous wind developer and the experience with AGL has been a lot better.</p> <p>Q1. Has the primary site been selected for the quarry site?</p> <p>A1. NC answered there are 2 potential sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SSW of Lakes Knob 2. Approximately 9 km’s north of Silverton 	
<p>5. Next meeting and close</p> <p>KE reminded CCC members and observers that the next meeting would be held on 27 June 2013 and at this meeting the topic of turbine locations will be discussed in detail.</p>	