

Meeting Record

Project Name	Mid North Wind Farm	Meeting Date	27 November 2014
Meeting / Subject	Community Liaison Group	Recorded By	AP
	Meeting 16	Total Pages	10

Facilitator:	Georgina House (GH)	Aurecon
Members:	Colin Endean (CE)	ACF Climate Project, Transition Action Group
	Sue Wurst (SW)	Clare
	David Clarke (DC)	Crystal Brook
	Garry Fieldhouse (GF)	Gally's, Farrell Flat
	Peter Edson (PE)	Burra Regional Tourism and Business Association
	Pip Edson (PE1)	Burra Regional Art Gallery
	Sally Fieldhouse (SF)	Gally's, Farrell Flat
Observers and Guests	Ian Falkenberg (IF)	Department Environment, Water and Natural Resources
	Kerry Ward (KW)	Member NRM Group
	Kelly-Anne Saffin (KAS)	Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North
EnergyAustralia	Clint Purkiss (CP)	Project Development Manager, EA
	Mike Clee (MC)	SA Operations Manager, EA
Apologies	Hon Dan van Holst Pellekaan	Honourable Member for Stuart
	Hon Geoff Brock	Honourable Member for Frome
	Abby Walker-Schwartz (AWS)	Waterloo Resident
	Amanda Redden (AR)	Economic Development Officer, Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North
	Andrew Allchurch (AA)	Gilbert Group CFS and Waterloo Landowner
	Anna Friebe (AF)	Burra Visitor Information Centre
	Chris Mosey (CM)	Waterloo Landowner
	Cindy Nolan (CN)	Clare
	Heidi Hodge (HH)	Black Springs Resident
	Paula Jones (PJ)	Burra Visitor Information Centre
	Trevor White (TW)	Planning Consultant and PhD Student
	Vincent Branson (VB)	Ngadjuri Walpa Juri Lands and Heritage Association Inc
Minute Taker	Adam Pfitzner (AP)	Aurecon

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
1.	Welcome and Apologies – Georgina House	
1.1.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GH welcomed members and observers to the 16th Mid North Wind Farm Community Liaison Group (CLG) Meeting. The theme of today's meeting is to look back at what has been achieved in 2014 and consider what the CLG would like to focus on in 2015. 	
1.2.	Apologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies received from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hon Dan van Holst Pellekaan Hon Geoff Brock Abby Walker-Schwartz Amanda Redden Andrew Allchurch Anna Friebel Chris Mosey Cindy Nolan Heidi Hodge Paula Jones Trevor White Vincent Branson Apologies were noted. 	
1.3.	Agenda and Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GH outlined today's agenda, which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EnergyAustralia Update Initiatives Update on Community Engagement CLG Health Check – A Plan for 2015 Other Business, including a short update on the Significant Environment Benefit Grant by Ian Falkenberg. 	
2.	Review Minutes of Previous Meeting – Georgina House	
	Actions arising from the minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 2 – Item 2 – Members and observers provided feedback on community observations and opinion since the last meeting in August 2014. <p>Pygmy Blue-tongue Lizard Story on Landline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP raised the Landline story regarding the Pygmy Blue-tongue Lizard, which featured Michael Bull and the conservation efforts in the local area. Members stated that the episode was well received within the community. The story helped raise general community awareness of the conservation efforts underway in the region. The story even helped some locals learn about the work underway. GH posed the question of whether more could be done to raise the profile of the Pygmy Blue-tongue Lizard and the conservation efforts off the back of the story? <p>Stony Gap Wind Farm Development Plan Consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recent decision of the South Australian Environment, Resources and Development (ERD) Court to grant Development Plan Consent to Energy Australia's Stony Gap Wind Farm development was raised. EA are pleased with the outcome and nature of the judgment (i.e. written form, 	Members and observers to monitor community opinion and feedback at CLG meetings

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
	<p>clear, concise judgement, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP indicated that the judgement will be a useful resource in the assessment of future similar projects, particularly useful to planners, decision making authorities and proponents of renewable energy projects. ○ GH suggested that, now that the Court judgement had been handed down, EA could approach the Regional Council of Goyder to see if a staff member and or elected member would be willing to join the CLG in an observer role. ○ Following the recent Council elections it would also be an opportune time to approach both the Regional Council of Goyder and Clare and Gilbert Valley Council to encourage each to participate in the CLG. ○ CP indicated that some Councillors could possibly join the CLG. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Page 5 – Item 4.1 – Waterloo Wind Farm Community Fund <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GH indicated that all actions relating to raising awareness and assessment of short-listed applications for Round 2 of the Waterloo Wind Farm Community Fund had been completed. A report on this topic is provided in Agenda Item 4.1. ● Page 6 – Item 4.2 – AR to follow up David Wilson (Tourism opportunity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GH carried this action over to the following meeting. ● GH asked if there were any comments or questions regarding the minutes. ● No comments were raised by the members. ● Members accepted the 21 August 2014 Minutes as a true representation of the meeting. 	<p>EA to approach the Regional Council of Goyder and Clare and Gilbert Valley Council to invite a staff and or elected member to attend CLG meetings in an observer capacity</p>
3.	Overview of EnergyAustralia Mid North Wind Farm Projects – Mike Clee and Clint Purkiss	
3.1	<p>Waterloo Wind Farm Update</p> <p>MC provided an update on Waterloo Wind Farm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Energy Production Figures July 2014 through to October 2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Favourable wind conditions during July resulted in a capacity factor of 53.56% (target 39.68%) and a new monthly record Net Generation of 43.58GWh (target 32.52GWh). However, the wind farm experienced lower than predicted winds for the past 3 months (August to October). ○ Financial Year to Date Net production is tracking at -6 % against plan. ● Site Operations / Maintenance has been pretty much business as usual. ● MC stated that EA are currently undertaking the following reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review and update of the 2015 Environmental Improvement Plan ○ Review and update of the 2015 Safety Improvement Plan ○ Review and update of the 2015 Business Plan ○ Management review of 2014. ● Pre-planning is underway for 2015 High Voltage Outage (testing of transformers, circuit breakers, capacitor banks, etc.) to ensure generation compliance. ● CLG member questioned how do EA set predicted wind generation targets (is it based on previous results)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP and MC indicated that the targets are set using wind prediction models. ● CLG member questioned whether wind patterns are changing and if so, is it a result of climate change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP/MC replied stating that it is not known to what extent climate change has an impact on wind patterns. ○ CP indicated that the wind prediction models take climate change (variations in air 	

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
	<p>temperature) into account when predicting wind targets. October was 12 degrees Celsius above the global average, therefore, due to the higher temperature, the wind is variable from the long-term average i.e. gusty (short periods of high speed winds).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP added that the targets are set prior to the construction of the wind farm. EnergyAustralia provide wind reports, prediction models, etc. to seek finance to invest in the Wind Farm project. ○ CP indicated that targets can be adjusted from time to time. 	
<p>3.2</p>	<p>Proposed Waterloo 2 Wind Farm Update</p> <p>CP provided an update on the Waterloo 2 Wind Farm Development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EnergyAustralia have identified an initiative in the ACT, where the ACT Government is aiming to have 90% of Canberra's electricity supply generated from large-scale renewables, by 2020. ● Essentially, the ACT Government is conducting a wind auction, which allows companies (e.g. EnergyAustralia) to bid to supply the ACT with renewable wind energy from Waterloo 2 project. The project is not required to be located within the ACT. ● EnergyAustralia has lodged a bid to ACT government and is expecting to find out the result in December 2014. ● DC asked whether Stony Gap could be used in the bid as well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP stated that the ACT initiative has particular evaluation criterion that determines the success of a bid. The Stony Gap project was considered to not meet the criteria associated with risks to timely delivery. ● CE stated that he had not heard of this idea to date and that it had not been picked up by media. 	
<p>3.3</p>	<p>Proposed Stony Gap Wind Farm Update</p> <p>CP provided an update on the Stony Gap Wind Farm Development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CP confirmed that the judgement of the South Australian Environment, Resources and Development (ERD) Court to grant Development Plan Consent to Energy Australia's Stony Gap Wind Farm development was handed down on the 4/11/2014 and that EnergyAustralia and the Joinders received copies of the decision on 6/11/2014. ● A copy of the decision can be found on the AustLii website (www.austlii.edu.au). Click 'Advanced Search', enter search query 'TRU ENERGY' (be sure to include the space), scroll down to 'South Australia: Environmental Resources and Development Court', click 'search', and then click on the returned result. ● CP indicated that the judgement contains clear statements and determinations around the acceptance of expert evidence. ● CP added that the conditions of approval are as expected and can be worked through. ● CP indicated that EnergyAustralia are unsure of when construction of Stony Gap will begin. A lot of details need to be considered and planned prior to construction including achieving building approval, design, consider potential suppliers, and look at investment strategies. Furthermore, the renewable energy policy debate needs to be monitored and market demand and supply factored in. ● CP stated that the Stony Gap Wind Farm project is a fantastic quality renewable energy project. ● A CLG member questioned whether carbon tax influences the closure of black coal stations or whether it is just simply supply and demand trends. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP and MC stated that carbon tax does affect the market. Black coal (~\$30-\$35 in MW/hr) is more expensive compared to brown coal (\$18-\$25 in MW/hr). Therefore, brown coal is cheaper to run. The Black coal stations are exposed to an international fuel price market, Brown coal is not. Therefore even accounting for the price on carbon, the added cost of CO2 from Brown coal does not bridge the cost gap between the two coal fuel sources. ○ MC stated that along with the introduction of renewables the energy market is currently over generated; and that the market is impacted by the closure or not of 	

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
	<p>fossil generated power stations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A CLG member questioned when the wind market decline occurred (how long ago)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP indicated that the market has seen a 70% decline in investment from 2013 to 2014. Whilst wind power and solar investment has declined 2014, the solar market has had huge success at the residential scale level. CP added that gas plants are under the most pressure, and the price of gas is likely to rise from \$4/PJ to international gas prices, Japan's current market price is \$17 PJ • A CLG member questioned how quickly could Wind Energy pick up the slack if other fossil generation didn't continue (hypothetical question)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP indicated that Wind Energy could pick up very quickly; however, the appropriate policy and resources would need to be in place (which is not the case at the moment). • GH questioned the CLG members as to what are the community expectations of the next steps for Stony Gap? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CLG members mentioned that learning more about the external influences would be beneficial; as it is clear to members that these external influences need to be worked through before local community considerations associated with the progression of the Stony Gap Wind Farm become the primary focus. ○ MC stated that the community are unlikely to understand the complexities associated with external influences. ○ CP said he would be happy to attempt to present an easy to understand presentation in 2015 around external influences and the current energy market. Members agreed this would be useful. ○ GH also suggested that EA could consider preparing an easy to read explanation of market influences. ○ Members also agreed that a key local focus should be on jobs and keeping locals in the area engaged in local employment 	<p>CP to prepare a presentation to the CLG on the energy market and influences</p>
4	Community Engagement Update / Initiatives Update	
4.1	<p>Summary of 2014 community engagement activities</p> <p>Mike Clee and Georgina House summarised key activities that have occurred in 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch of the \$20,000 Waterloo Wind Farm Community Fund (2 rounds of \$10,000). • Launch of a retail offer for local residents. • Successful partnership application for a Significant Environmental Benefit Grant (\$290,000). • Port Adelaide Football Club partnership – community events in May and July 2014. • Community Liaison Group meetings (x4) well attended. • Increase in positive media coverage. • Completion of a Community Perceptions Survey. 	
4.2	<p>Waterloo Wind Farm Community Fund - Round 2</p> <p>Mike Clee summarised Round 2 activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 applications were submitted for a diverse range of local projects. • Shortlisted applications were reviewed by the CLG sub-committee. • 5 projects received a share in \$10,000 funding as detailed below. • Mike thanks the CLG sub-committee for their time and assistance reviewing and providing valuable direction on Round 2 recipients. 	

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By																					
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Group</th> <th>Project</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SA Country Carers</td> <td>Shelter for Saddleworth op shop front door</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manoora Primary School</td> <td>Vegetable Garden expansion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Saddleworth Lawn Tennis Club</td> <td>Shade sail for Saddleworth Community Playground</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robertstown Bowling Club</td> <td>Replace shades around bowling green</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Richardson Park</td> <td>Playground / recreation area</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SW CLG suggested that EA invite the grant recipients to join the CLG or attend on occasion to report on their project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP indicated that it was a good idea and it would be interesting to see the progress of the individual projects. GH agreed and said it was another opportunity to increase membership of the CLG. 	Group	Project	SA Country Carers	Shelter for Saddleworth op shop front door	Manoora Primary School	Vegetable Garden expansion	Saddleworth Lawn Tennis Club	Shade sail for Saddleworth Community Playground	Robertstown Bowling Club	Replace shades around bowling green	Richardson Park	Playground / recreation area	GH to discuss with EA the idea of inviting grant recipients to CLG meetings									
Group	Project																						
SA Country Carers	Shelter for Saddleworth op shop front door																						
Manoora Primary School	Vegetable Garden expansion																						
Saddleworth Lawn Tennis Club	Shade sail for Saddleworth Community Playground																						
Robertstown Bowling Club	Replace shades around bowling green																						
Richardson Park	Playground / recreation area																						
4.3	<p>Proposed 2015 community engagement activities</p> <p>Mike Clee summarised proposed community engagement activities for 2015.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Activity</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Community Liaison Group</td> <td>Regular meetings led by an independent facilitator</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical to maintain ongoing consultation/dialogue with key community stakeholders </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Government/Council</td> <td>Maintain strong relations</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet with new local council representatives Site visit with government relations team Inclusion in CLG </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Media</td> <td>Ongoing proactive story generation</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific media stories to build reputation in key areas – i.e. community partnerships, environment, compliance, performance </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community Updates</td> <td>Local media adverts</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective means to share information about Waterloo wind farm operations with the broader community </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community Fund</td> <td>Grants to support local projects</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20k funding for local initiatives to benefit the community </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landholder event</td> <td>Landholder liaison opportunity</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual event for landholder engagement. Increased informal phone & face-to-face contact with landholders also required. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members were pleased that the Community Fund was going to continue in 2015. 	Activity	Description	Comments	Community Liaison Group	Regular meetings led by an independent facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical to maintain ongoing consultation/dialogue with key community stakeholders 	Government/Council	Maintain strong relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet with new local council representatives Site visit with government relations team Inclusion in CLG 	Media	Ongoing proactive story generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific media stories to build reputation in key areas – i.e. community partnerships, environment, compliance, performance 	Community Updates	Local media adverts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective means to share information about Waterloo wind farm operations with the broader community 	Community Fund	Grants to support local projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20k funding for local initiatives to benefit the community 	Landholder event	Landholder liaison opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual event for landholder engagement. Increased informal phone & face-to-face contact with landholders also required. 	
Activity	Description	Comments																					
Community Liaison Group	Regular meetings led by an independent facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical to maintain ongoing consultation/dialogue with key community stakeholders 																					
Government/Council	Maintain strong relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet with new local council representatives Site visit with government relations team Inclusion in CLG 																					
Media	Ongoing proactive story generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific media stories to build reputation in key areas – i.e. community partnerships, environment, compliance, performance 																					
Community Updates	Local media adverts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective means to share information about Waterloo wind farm operations with the broader community 																					
Community Fund	Grants to support local projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20k funding for local initiatives to benefit the community 																					
Landholder event	Landholder liaison opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual event for landholder engagement. Increased informal phone & face-to-face contact with landholders also required. 																					
4.4	<p>Community Perception Survey, Attitudes and Key Findings</p> <p>Mike Clee summarised the findings of a recent community perception survey undertaken in the past two months by an independent company on behalf of EA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of the community perception survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish baseline indications of community perceptions. Understand drivers of community acceptance. Obtain foresight into possible risks. Enable strategic planning of engagement initiatives & community investment. Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterloo, Clare, Burra and surrounds. Views on existing operations & proposed developments. Opinions of operator, brand, industry. Specifically tested engagement, transparency & responsiveness. 																						

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By												
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Telephone survey of 124 people. ○ Two focus groups involving 14 participants. ○ Five in depth interviews. ○ One local MP consulted. • Community attitudes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The vast majority of people in the community either support (68%) or are ambivalent (25%) about the presence of wind farms in the Mid North. Only 7% say they are opposed to wind farms. ○ 93% have heard about Waterloo Wind Farm, but only 6% can name EnergyAustralia as the operator. ○ Perceived benefits and drawbacks of wind farms: <table border="1" data-bbox="331 846 946 1196" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center;">Pros</th> <th style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center;">Cons</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e1f5fe;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities • Investment in local economy • Environmental benefits – clean energy </td> <td style="background-color: #e1f5fe;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact • Cost of energy • Impact on neighbours • Noise </td> </tr> </table> • Key Findings <table border="1" data-bbox="280 1240 1241 1742" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 10px;">Employment is a big issue</td> <td style="background-color: #e1f5fe; padding: 10px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment was a key concern for the community, in particular youth employment opportunities • Jobs and investment in local economy are seen as the key benefits of wind farms • Providing local employment opportunities is viewed as central to community engagement </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 10px;">Low general knowledge of wind farms</td> <td style="background-color: #e1f5fe; padding: 10px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good awareness of Waterloo wind farm but low levels of knowledge about wind energy generally • Lack of understanding of why wind farms in Mid North region • Low recognition of EnergyAustralia as operator of Waterloo </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 10px;">Noise not such a concern</td> <td style="background-color: #e1f5fe; padding: 10px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are sensitive to those directly impacted by wind farms but think claims of health and noise impacts are overstated • Main concerns with wind farms were around the visual impact to the region and the cost of energy </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 10px;">What is legitimate community engagement?</td> <td style="background-color: #e1f5fe; padding: 10px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employing local people was seen as key • Work with the community – partnerships / collaborative projects • Support local initiatives and groups through community grants • Be part of the community and make a contribution </td> </tr> </table> • CLG members accepted the findings of the community perception survey and suggested that it would be of interest and value for EA to present to Local Councils and relevant Government Agencies. The survey findings provide a good summary of community opinion and provides clear guidance on what the community would like to focus on. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CP and MC agreed that sharing and presenting the survey methodology and findings with government and local government would be a good idea. ○ believed it to be a good idea. 	Pros	Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities • Investment in local economy • Environmental benefits – clean energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact • Cost of energy • Impact on neighbours • Noise 	Employment is a big issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment was a key concern for the community, in particular youth employment opportunities • Jobs and investment in local economy are seen as the key benefits of wind farms • Providing local employment opportunities is viewed as central to community engagement 	Low general knowledge of wind farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good awareness of Waterloo wind farm but low levels of knowledge about wind energy generally • Lack of understanding of why wind farms in Mid North region • Low recognition of EnergyAustralia as operator of Waterloo 	Noise not such a concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are sensitive to those directly impacted by wind farms but think claims of health and noise impacts are overstated • Main concerns with wind farms were around the visual impact to the region and the cost of energy 	What is legitimate community engagement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employing local people was seen as key • Work with the community – partnerships / collaborative projects • Support local initiatives and groups through community grants • Be part of the community and make a contribution 	<p>EA to consider presenting survey method and findings to relevant government and local government entities</p>
Pros	Cons													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities • Investment in local economy • Environmental benefits – clean energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact • Cost of energy • Impact on neighbours • Noise 													
Employment is a big issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment was a key concern for the community, in particular youth employment opportunities • Jobs and investment in local economy are seen as the key benefits of wind farms • Providing local employment opportunities is viewed as central to community engagement 													
Low general knowledge of wind farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good awareness of Waterloo wind farm but low levels of knowledge about wind energy generally • Lack of understanding of why wind farms in Mid North region • Low recognition of EnergyAustralia as operator of Waterloo 													
Noise not such a concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are sensitive to those directly impacted by wind farms but think claims of health and noise impacts are overstated • Main concerns with wind farms were around the visual impact to the region and the cost of energy 													
What is legitimate community engagement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employing local people was seen as key • Work with the community – partnerships / collaborative projects • Support local initiatives and groups through community grants • Be part of the community and make a contribution 													
5	CLG Health Check – A Plan for 2015 – Georgina House													

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GH conducted a health check with CLG members. This involved a discussion around a series of questions with the aim to providing clear direction on what the CLG would like to focus on in 2015. • GH asked: How is the CLG going? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SF mentioned that the ‘apology list’ each meeting is disappointing. ○ GH agreed that ideally we should look to increase membership from 20 members to at least 30 members as this would likely see the average attendance increase to 20 members per meeting. ○ Advertising for a call for nominations in the local newspapers was agreed by members. ○ Inviting recipients of Round 1 and 2 of the Waterloo Wind Farm Community Fund was supported by members. ○ Inviting landholders and neighbours of the proposed Waterloo 2 Wind Farm and Stony Gap Wind Farm was supported by members. ○ A CLG member stated that a recent media release for Stony Gap mentioned the CLG, and was curious if EA had received any enquiries to join the CLG? ○ CP was not sure in regard to the CLG, but EnergyAustralia website has seen some enquiries in regard to the Stony Gap project this last week. ○ CLG members suggested that a representative (co-ordinator and a youth representative) from each of the two Youth Advisory Councils (YACs) be invited to join the CLG, and as stated earlier in the meeting, that representatives of each of the two local Councils be approached to join the CLG in an observer role. • GH asked ‘Are you happy with the construct of the grants program and the type of programs awarded grants?’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A CLG member stated that nominations of ‘grass roots’ projects is good/positive, and then informality of the grants process was welcomed given that some other grants processes are quite onerous for applicants to complete. ○ A CLG member queried whether the successful recipients are followed up (on progress). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MC stated Hannah does keep in touch with recipients and EA will get official updates. ○ Members were happy with the grants process to continue in a similar way in 2015. • GH asked ‘Does the community perception research suggest the grants funding criteria needs refreshment?’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A CLG member raised the matter of a competitor offering a community grant of \$50,000 (compared to EA’s \$20,000). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MC stated that an increase in the grant amount is difficult to justify and stated that where some companies offer more in one area they tend to offer less in another. For instance, EA has a number of other initiatives that benefit the local community. GH agreed it is hard to compare “apples with apples”. ○ A CLG member added that the ‘grass roots’ project recipients are happy to receive small funding, it all helps achieve local projects. ○ CLG members are happy with the grants process. 	<p>GH and EA to identify and pursue ways to increase CLG membership, including advertising in local newspapers, inviting fund recipients, and inviting landholders and neighbours</p> <p>EA to monitor enquiries for potential interest in joining the CLG</p> <p>Invite/encourage representatives of the YACs and Local Councils to join the CLG</p> <p>EA to obtain official updates from grant recipients</p> <p>EA to continue to offer grant in similar way in 2015</p>

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GH asked: 'Is the CLG charter still relevant, or does the focus need to change?' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CLG members stated that the charter's 'purpose' statement could be expanded upon as it is a bit limiting. ○ The purpose statement currently reads: ○ "A Community Liaison Group set up to discuss the Waterloo and Stony Gap Wind Farm Projects" ○ Members agreed that in addition to discussing local wind farm projects, they enjoy understanding and discussing the wider energy/renewable energy market, policy and associated influencing factors and implications locally. ○ GH to draft a revised Group Charter purpose statement for consideration by the CLG. ○ CP stated that he would be happy to present on more sectors of EnergyAustralia (i.e. consumers' bills (breakdown), other energy markets, storage methods, etc.) ○ Members were otherwise happy with the wording of the Group Charter. ● GH asked: 'What is important to you?' and 'What do we want to focus on in 2015?' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CLG members are interested in the opportunities for community investment (community run wind farms), where has this been achieved elsewhere? Can wind farms be down-scaled to enable investment by smaller communities? (e.g. community ownership of 1 or 2 turbines within a project) What are the different investment models available around the world? ○ The CLG would like an update on how EnergyAustralia and the wind farm industry generally are coping with environmental group interest and what is the latest factual information – more biological content would be appreciated, bird count information? (i.e. in regard to raptors, lizards, etc – ways to improve conservation outcomes) Could potentially invite Cindy Hull back to speak. Other potential speakers to be investigated, perhaps local ecologists? ○ Information on the Renewable Energy Target (RET) and the government's stance/policy on renewable energy (different sides of the story). ○ Conduct another tour of the Waterloo Wind Farm and provide information on how the turbines work, where they are manufactured, how much energy it costs to make and ship them, construction process, maintenance requirements, how electricity is generated, how much is produced, how this is feed into the grid. ○ Further update on the Pygmy Bluetongue Lizard and other wildlife in the area. ○ Native vegetation – what exists in the area, what is threatened and what can be done to assist conservation? Perhaps linked with another presentation by Glenn Christie regarding seed collection, revegetation programs, grasslands, what is currently being done in the area? Health of the understory in wind farm areas? Updates on the progress of the SEB Project by Greening Australia and DEWNR. ○ Perhaps invite another proponent, such as Terry Kallis, Principal of Kallis & Co and a shareholder of the CERES Wind Farm project on the Yorke Peninsula, to speak about their experiences. ○ KAS suggested EA consider preparing an Economic Development Engagement Strategy which could address economic opportunities for the local area/region if Stony Gap is pursued, and assist the region prepare for local procurement, rental market planning, and outlining multiplier effects, etc. ● GH asked: 'How many CLG meetings in 2015?' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The CLG agreed that there should be four (4) meetings in 2015. ○ GH indicated that the first meeting is likely to be scheduled for March 2015. 	<p>GH to revise the Group Charter purpose statement and present at the next meeting</p> <p>GH to work with EA to plan presentations and discussions around the ideas provided by members</p> <p>GH to plan the meeting schedule for 2015</p>
6	Other Business	

Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
	<p>Significant Environmental Benefit (SEB) Project Update provided by Ian Falkenberg, DEWNR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget of \$290,000 to be spent in the first 12 months. • Most of the work is occurring south of Burra (Tothills, Waterloo, Logans Gap and Stony Gap areas). • The target this round is to involve 20 landholders in the projects (landscape project) with links from East to West, and North to South. • Have 12 landholders on board to date, mostly around the Stony Gap, Worlds End, Tothills areas). • A key challenge is to get outcomes in the southern part of the area, due to the terrain and fragmented land. • Anne from Greening Australia is involved to work with landholders, landholder engagement and spatial mapping will ramp up soon. • Incentives for landholders relate to modifying grazing practices and weed/pest control. • Ian happy to provide a more detailed update in the new year. • SW suggested that a one-page summary sheet be produced by DEWNR and/or Greening Australia and circulated to CLG and others in the community outlining the basis of the project. • Ian Falkenberg agreed a good idea to produce a one-page summary of the SEB Project, including a map of the project area. 	<p>Ian Falkenberg to send a one-page summary of the SEB Project and provide to the CLG</p>
7.	Next Meeting and Close –Georgina House	
	<p>Next CLG Meeting – Likely to be a Thursday in March 2015 – 4.30pm to 6.30pm at Gally’s</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GH thanked all for their attendance at this meeting and for their involvement in meetings held throughout the year. • Minutes of this meeting will be distributed to all for review. • One week will be provided for members to review draft minutes and provide any feedback to Georgina House. • Once finalised, the minutes will be placed on the EnergyAustralia Website and circulated to other key stakeholders. <p style="text-align: center;">Meeting Closed</p>	<p>GH to schedule next meeting and circulate to CLG Members in the New Year</p>
SUPPER		

Georgina House Contact Details:

Georgina.house@arecongroup.com Ph: 08 8237 9600. Mobile: 0414 454 105. Fax: 08 8237 9778.

Postal Address: Georgina House, Aurecon, 55 Grenfell Street, Adelaide SA 5000.