



Meeting Record

Project Name	Mid North Wind Farm	Meeting Date	19 April 2012
Meeting / Subject	Community Liaison Group	Recorded By	MP
	Meeting 3	Total Pages	13

Facilitator:	Georgina House (GH)	Aurecon
Members:	Andrew Allchurch (AA)	Gilbert Group CFS
	Cindy Nolan (CN)	Regional Development Australia
	Chris Mosey (CM)	Waterloo Landowner
	Colin Edean (CE)	ACF Climate Project, Transition Action Group
	David Clarke (DC)	Crystal Brook
	John Faint (JF)	Waterloo and District Concerned Citizens Group
	Peter Edson (PE)	Burra Regional Tourism and Business Association
	Pip Edson (PE1)	Burra Regional Art Gallery
	Yvonne Cloke (YC)	Barossa Lower North Futures Inc
TRUenergy Representatives	Clint Purkiss (CP)	Project Development Manager
	Michael Head (MH)	Project Development Manager, Business Development, OHS&E (Cathedral Rocks and Waterloo)
	Nick Batchelor (NB)	Commercial Manager, Business Development
Guests	Dr Travis How (TH)	Director, EBS Ecology and EBS Restoration
	Dr Cindy Hull (CH)	Avian Specialist, Hydro Tasmania
Observers	Trevor White (TW)	Wind Farm Liaison Officer
	Andy Sharp (AS)	Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board (NYNRM)
	Jarrod White (JW)	Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board (NYNRM)
	Bob Lamb (BL)	Stop Industrial Wind Turbines Group
	Phil Pilgrim (PP)	General Interest
Apologies	Abby Walker-Schwartz (AWS)	Waterloo Resident
	Glenn Christie (GC)	Barossa
	Heidi Hodge (HH)	Black Springs Resident
	Lis Jones Ingman (LJI)	Burra
	Lisa Busch (LB)	New Member
	Jenny Turner (JT)	Burra Community Management Committee
	Hon Dan van Holst Pellekaan (DHP)	Member for Stuart
	Hon Tom Koutsantonis MP (TK)	Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business
	Rowan Ramsey MP (RR)	Member for Grey
	Vincent Branson (VB)	Ngadjuri Walpa Juri Lands and Heritage Association Inc
Minute Taker	Mel Pinding (MP)	Aurecon



Meeting Record

Item	Topic	Action By
1	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	<p>Welcome by GH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GH welcomed everyone to the third Mid North Wind Farm Community Liaison Group (CLG) Meeting. • Special welcome to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – New Member: Chris Mosey – Observers: Trevor White (Wind Farm Liaison Officer), Andy Sharp (NYNRM), Jarrod White (NYNRM), Bob Lamb (Stop Industrial Wind Turbines Group), Phil Pilgrim – TRUenergy representatives: Michael Head, Clint Purkiss, Nick Batchelor – Guests: Dr Travis How (EBS Ecology/EBS Restoration), Dr Cindy Hull (Hydro Tasmania) – Introduction to Georgina House (facilitator) and Mel Pinding (minute taker) from Aurecon 	
1.2	<p>Apologies (GH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abby Walker-Schwartz, Glenn Christie, Heidi Hodge, Lis Jones Ingman, Lisa Busch, Jenny Turner, Vincent Branson, Hon Dan van Holst Pellekaan, Hon Tom Koutsantonis MP, Rowan Ramsey MP 	
1.3	<p>Agenda and Housekeeping (GH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline of revised agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Item 4 – Current issues and concerns from John Faint on behalf of the Waterloo and District Concerned Citizens Group – Previous Item 5 – removed – CFS segment postponed to a future meeting due to unavailability • All questions to be directed through the facilitator. • Thanks to Gally's for hosting this meeting. 	
2	<p>Review Minutes of Previous Meeting (GH)</p> <p><u>Action Points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lis Jones Ingman has asked the minutes to reflect that whilst she is a member of the Burra Community Management Committee, she is not representing the organisation at CLG Meetings. • <i>Item 4, page 12</i> – Action: MH to work with TRUenergy to plan a further update on noise assessment, including reference points at Waterloo – this is proposed as part of agenda item 3. <p><u>Questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Edson: With reference to <i>Item 3.2, page 5 – Overview of Economic Benefits: Shop Local'</i> – would be interested if a TRUenergy representative could attend the Burra Regional Tourism and Business Association AGM meeting to be held on the fourth Tuesday in August (PE to confirm date) to discuss this in more detail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Michael Head committed to attend this meeting 	<p>PE to confirm AGM date and opportunity for TRUenergy to attend and present</p>



Meeting Record

3	<p>Michael Head - Overview of TRUenergy Mid North Wind Farm Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MH thanked all for attending • MH provided an update on TRUenergy's Mid North wind farm projects 	
3.1	<p>Waterloo Wind Farm Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January was a good month of operation, with slight decline in Capacity Factor in February and improvement in March • In three months since last CLG meeting, no OHSE Incidents to report (Lost Time Injuries) • Civil remediation has begun on site, including hydro-mulching of disturbed ground on site • Noise monitoring conducted for 3 months at a nearby residence with a report submitted to EPA SA. Report indicates full noise compliance and results have been communicated to the occupant directly • Bush Fire Response Plan in place – update to be provided at a future meeting when CFS personnel are in attendance • MH has responded directly to all emails posed via TRUenergy's talktous@truenergy.com.au email address • MH provided an overview of Waterloo Wind Farm noise monitoring results at 5 locations • All figures represented have been submitted to the EPA as part of Waterloo Wind Farm's Compliance Report February 2012 and subsequent noise monitoring reports produced by TRUenergy in response to noise complaints. In each case the EPA SA has confirmed compliance in accordance with the EPA SA guidelines document <i>Wind Farms – Environmental Noise Guidelines, July 2009</i> • TRUenergy is working through legal and privacy issues related to the release of noise monitoring results • TRUenergy is committed to being transparent with noise monitoring on its wind farms and will work with CLG and EPA to develop an industry leading process 	
3.2	<p>Stony Gap Wind Farm Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPBC Referral has been made to the Federal Minister in relation to the Pygmy Blue Tongue Lizard – awaiting response from Minister. • EPBC does not affect the Local Government Development Assessment process • All submissions received and a response document to be issued to Regional Council of Goyder • Proposed date for DAP Hearing is 9 May 2012 – planning decision is likely to be provided after the DAP Hearing for consideration 	
3.3	<p>Waterloo 2 Wind Farm Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All technical studies received in draft • Although no <i>Eucalyptus odorata</i> will be cleared under the Development Application an EPBC referral will be made to the Federal Minister. Ministerial response to be provided at the next CLG meeting • All Landholder Agreements are in place • Community Information Day to be held on date and time to be discussed with the CLG • Development Application likely to be submitted to Clare and Gilbert Valley Council in first half of 2012 • Development Application and associated technical studies will be published on TRUenergy website upon submission to Clare and Gilbert Valley Council 	



Meeting Record

<p>3.4</p>	<p>Robertstown Wind Farm Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of TRUenergy Development Application for an extension to the current permit for the wind monitoring mast at Robertstown will be assessed by the Regional Council of Goyder DAP on 9th May 2012 Two submissions received by Regional Council of Goyder. A response document has been submitted by TRUenergy to Regional Council of Goyder. 	
<p>3.5</p>	<p>Questions and Points of Clarification</p> <p>Q: Location A Noise Monitoring Results – there are a lot of red dots above the black line.</p> <p>A: On all of the figures there are a certain number of data points located above the noise limit line. This is a common measurement result both during pre-construction monitoring, before the wind farm is built, and as part of a post-construction monitoring campaign. The figure below shows as example of noise levels measured during a pre-construction survey, with several data points lying above the noise limit line.</p> <div data-bbox="375 951 1203 1480" data-label="Figure"> </div> <p>Points above the line are generally due to background noise events, for example, vehicles passing by or insect noise. The SA Guidelines requires that a regression line be plotted through the data set. The regression line effectively averages the collected noise data so that one-off events such as a vehicle pass by do not skew the results. The SA Guidelines require the regression line to be compared to the noise limit to assess compliance. The results show Location A is noise compliant.</p> <p>Q: What would represent non-compliance?</p> <p>A: If the red line was above the black line that would indicate non-compliance.</p> <p>Q: Was background noise taken out of those results?</p> <p>A: Yes in Locations B through to E. Pre-construction data could not be used as a comparison for the results of Location A as no pre-construction testing was undertaken due to the distance of Location A (4.3km) from the nearest Wind Turbine Generator.</p>	



Meeting Record

	<p>Q: What are the measurements along the bottom of the charts? <i>A: The measurement up the side is the Sound Pressure Level in dBA – the measure along the bottom is wind speed.</i></p> <p>Q: Why don't you make all the results and research available to everyone? <i>A: We make the information available to landholders who request the information. We are transparent with this information as far as is legally possible. We have to respect the privacy of the landowners.</i></p> <p>Q: You have provided results for 5 sites – are they the only sites tested? <i>A: The 5 sites presented are just examples as we are unable to provide specific information that may compromise the privacy of householders. I'm happy to elaborate further at a future meeting if desired.</i></p> <p>Q: With regard to the location diagrams – how many locations do you take data from to establish the line of best fit? Do you only take from dwellings within the wind farm, or dwellings close-by as well? <i>A: We include dwellings within close proximity to the wind farm, both within and near to the wind farm. Location A at 4.3km away from the nearest wind turbine generator for example and it is not directly associated with a wind farm. Noise monitoring data must be submitted to EPA SA within three months of wind farm operation.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Noise Monitoring Results A-E are included as an attachment to these minutes.</i></p>	
	<p>Statements:</p> <p>(DC): I have never heard of a wind turbine generator being monitored for noise from 4.3km away – are they even audible?</p> <p>(BL): I live 10km away and they are audible from that distance. 2 weeks ago I was kept up 2 nights in a row with the noise, and my wife was kept up also.</p> <p>(JF): I live 4.3km away from the nearest turbine and on overcast nights, I can hear the turbines above the television.</p>	
	<p>Q: With regard to Stony Gap – were the submissions received by Council or EPBC? <i>A: Council.</i></p> <p>Q: Why are you holding a Community Information Day rather than a meeting? <i>A: We will ask the group for ideas on this later in the meeting.</i></p> <p>Q: If there were 31 submissions for Stony Gap, 22 of which were objections – how much sway do the objections hold over the assessment? <i>A: TRUenergy will respond to each of the submissions – if we respond accordingly and fulfil any applicable requirements then it is up to the relevant planning authority to assess the application on its merits.</i></p> <p>Q: So the objections alone are not enough? <i>A: The submissions are judged on merit and on whether our response to that submission responds satisfactorily.</i></p>	



Meeting Record

4	<p>John Faint – Statement from Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• JF thanked the group for the opportunity to speak at this meeting and read out a statement prepared by the Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group. The Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group is a group of local residents with concerns about the Waterloo Wind Farm. JF, in his role as Chair of the Group, spoke to a statement prepared by the Group. <p><i>“The Waterloo and District Concerned Citizens Group was formed because as individuals, our concerns were largely ignored by the proponents and government decision makers.</i></p> <p><i>The aim of this group is to expose the truth about the highly controversial and the damaging impact that the Waterloo Wind Farm has created.</i></p> <p><i>As a group we want to see major changes to the location of the Wind Farms, so that the disastrous social break-up and bitterness, the vast environmental damage, both to the terrain and the breeding habitat of so many birds and animals, and now the serious health issues due to noise and pulsations, should not have, and will not happen again – and so various meetings with politicians, acousticians and doctors have, and will be continuing.</i></p> <p><i>Because of noise it was both disturbing and distressing at one meeting to hear how people’s lives are being ruined from sleep deprivation. Two families have left the area and at least two other families have alternate places to sleep. Both Trevor White and a doctor were present at that meeting. As a result, TRUenergy were formally written to, asking them to shut off the wind farm at night. This was refused; they haven’t even bothered to contact us to discuss the issue.</i></p> <p><i>The impact of our meetings and concerns has caused a number of public meetings in the region to be held, and now various politicians are working with us to have the necessary changes made.</i></p> <p><i>The original submissions to Council and a recent independent survey conducted, clearly showed that the Waterloo Community did not, and does not want a Wind Farm in its area. Only 20.8% favoured and 68% said no.</i></p> <p><i>The comments in the media made by the Senior Manager, Renewable Development TRUenergy were both offensive and totally misleading and his naming of a person for her comments in reply showed total disrespect, when she is desperately trying to protect her family from these destructive turbines. This shows lack of compassion by a person who lives nowhere near a Wind Farm, and so is not qualified to make assumptions. This is not a personal attack on him, but is meant to be constructive comment. Remember, Wind Farms are not only about money and power lines.</i></p> <p><i>Our group would never have been formed, and meetings like this one not needed if proper research into the locations of Wind Farms and the impact on communities and the environment thoroughly conducted.</i></p> <p><i>We are not opposed to other forms of renewable energy generation, but the location of Wind Farms certainly needs to be addressed.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, TRUenergy, do yourselves and us a favour and take all your plans for Wind Farms well away from residential areas and stop ruining people’s lives and the environment!”</i></p>	
---	---	--



Meeting Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GH thanked JF for providing this statement and acknowledged the range of opinions raised in the statement. MH noted that the minutes of CLG Meetings are viewed by people in management at TRUenergy and are taken seriously. JF acknowledged this comment by TRUenergy. GH asked JF if the statement could form part of the minutes. JF to confirm this with the Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group. GH clarified that the survey mentioned in the statement was undertaken by a student It was also mentioned that the results of the survey have been publically released without the student's consent. <p>Q: How many people make up the Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group? A: There are 6 members.</p> <p>Q: Of the Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group members, do any have a turbine on their land? A: No.</p>	
	<p>Statements:</p> <p>JF mentioned that the survey was undertaken by a master student at the University of Adelaide who went through Council, and that he assisted and helped distribute the survey to all within 5km of the wind farms.</p> <p>AA knows two families who live within 2km of the turbines who were not approached for this survey.</p> <p>Q: What does the Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group think of the ElectraNet Substation – which will produce noise? A: <i>If there are any issues, they will be raised.</i></p> <p>Q: Of the 37 turbines at Waterloo – how many would the Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group consider to be ideally located? A: <i>Not many of them – it's a complex situation; you can't just turn one off.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GH acknowledged that this is a complex issue and encouraged members to maintain the open and respectful conversations being had at CLG Meetings 	
5	Flora and Fauna Presentations	
5.1	<p>Dr Travis How, Ecologist, EBS – Presentation on Ecology Survey Techniques and Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GH introduced Dr Travis How TH spoke about “<i>Ecological Assessment – Stony Gap and Waterloo Wind Farms</i>” Assessment begins with an initial assessment over a broad area to determine what is there or likely to be there, then targeted surveys for threatened species or at risk species Following this, detailed vegetation surveys of infrastructure corridors are undertaken and assessed, followed by micro-siting, calculation of SEB requirements and EPBC referral (if required) 	



Meeting Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assessment methods for vegetation include research, surveys, mapping and assessment of listed communities ● Assessment methods for fauna include research, targeted surveys, bird surveys, bat surveys ● Key Findings from Waterloo Stage 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 16 different ecological surveys/studies undertaken across Stage 1 and 2 from 2004 to present – <i>Eucalyptus odorata</i> Woodland – good quality, will be avoided, EPBC referral will be submitted as a risk management strategy – Wedge-tail Eagle Nest – not active at time of survey ● Key Findings from Stony Gap <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 5 studies undertaken since 2008 – Two threatened ecological communities – Seven flora species of state significance – One nationally threatened reptile species found on site – No nationally threatened birds or migratory species recorded – Three species of state significant recorded and a number of other potential species – Raptors - 4 Wedge Tailed Eagle nests recorded in the study area, and 1 Peregrine Falcon nest recorded in the study area – Pygmy Blue-tongue (PBT) - two populations of nationally threatened PBT Lizard found within wind farm area (total of 5 individuals recorded and mapped) ● Consultation occurring with PBT Recovery Team ● Working through management of known populations with aim to avoid any direct impacts ● Developing management strategies to minimise indirect impacts (i.e. water runoff from hard stand areas) 	
SUPPER BREAK		
5.2	<p>Questions and Points of Clarification</p> <p>Q: <i>Is an anabat a breed of bat?</i> A: <i>No, it's a recording device which records bat calls and patterns.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>Is an anabat able to detect most species of bat?</i> A: <i>Yes, most species.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>Is any micro-chipping done, particularly on birds?</i> A: <i>No, not in South Australia.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>Do you know anything of the Flinders Worm-Lizard?</i> A: <i>The Flinders Worm-Lizard is a legless lizard, quite common, normally present from Spring through to Summer. It's around the size of a pencil and is found only in South Australia. It has a national rating but no state rating as the state ratings have been updated more recently than the national ratings.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>When analysing the Anabat data, is it measured against known bat calls and patterns or by a bat expert?</i> A: <i>A combination of methods, but we also use experts such as those from the South Australian Museum.</i></p>	



Meeting Record

	<p>Q: You talk about revegetation, but you can't revegetate near the turbines as the contracts prohibit it. A: The landholder contracts do not prohibit that activity, they just ask for prior consultation with TRUenergy. Two landowners, each with contracts, reinforced that the contract doesn't prohibit revegetation.</p> <p>Q: Do your surveys include microbats? A: Yes – all microbats.</p> <p>Q: With regard to the population of two and three Pygmy Blue-tongue Lizards – is there any record of other populations in the Mid North and how does this compare? A: There are other populations in the mid north with possibly one or two thousand individuals but these are outside the wind farm area (north of Burra). The population on the western side of the wind farm could be much larger as potential habitat extends outside of the wind farm area and therefore may contain more animals.</p>	
	<p>Note: Peter and Pip Edson left the meeting at this point.</p>	
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Dr Cindy Hull, Avian Specialist, Hydro Tasmania – Presentation on Avian Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GH introduced Dr Cindy Hull ● CH spoke about “<i>The Effects of Wind Farms on Birds</i>” ● CH provided an overview of the potential impacts of wind farms, how monitoring is conducted and results, management interventions and their success, myths and facts, and bird mortalities from other human sources ● There are two potential impacts of wind farms on birds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Construction (short-term visual or noise disturbance, destruction of habitat, decline in quality of habitat) – these are usually resolved through careful micro-siting and appropriate management strategies – Operation/Maintenance (direct impacts – collisions, and indirect impacts – alienation and barrier effects) ● Effects can be monitored by collision monitoring and bird surveys ● Only approximately 20% of the birds that are found on the sites are involved in collisions. Therefore just being on site does not mean you are necessarily prone to collision with turbines. Only some species are at risk and one of the key factors in collision risk is if you fly around the region the blades move through. ● Results of eagle behaviour studies for Bluff Point – 5179 flights observed with clear avoidance behaviour observed ● Standard approach to environmental management – Avoid – Mitigate – Offset ● Mythbusting - key points to note, wind farms <u>do not</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – suck birds into turbines – stop birds migrating – change weather patterns – cause climate change ● No other generator except wind farms study impacts to birds ● Climate change is the most important impact to birds – estimated bird extinction rates will be between 2-72% (72% in north-eastern Australia) 	



Meeting Record

5.4	<p>Questions and Points of Clarification</p> <p>Q: <i>The nest which showed eagle avoidance - how far was it from the turbine?</i> A: 230m.</p> <p>Q: <i>At Waterloo these studies were done before construction, so why weren't the turbines moved?</i> A: <i>The focus is on listed species, and eagles are not a listed species in the Mid North.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>Is it only direct collisions which cause injury to birds or also flying close to the turbines, as is the case for bats?</i> A: <i>I believe the jury is out on barotrauma (the name given to the theory that pressure waves can cause damage to bat internal organs), and further investigations are required to determine if it does occur and if it does, how common it is. There is no evidence for the same effect (if it is real) on birds.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>Where there are a lot of wind farms – where will the eagles go? They are already locally threatened.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>Are the eagles actually being displaced?</i> A: <i>No the eagles are not being displaced.</i></p> <p>Q: <i>How many Wedge Tailed Eagle strikes have there been at the Woolnorth Site in Tasmania?</i> A: <i>18 strikes over 10 years – a mixture of sexes and age. There is a publically available report, available from Hydro Tasmania and further studies are being undertaken.</i></p>	
6	<p>Nick Batchelor, TRUenergy – Overview of TRUenergy Geothermal and Solar Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NB gave an overview of “TRUenergySolar and Geothermal Projects” ● Three key segments make up the Solar Market – Residential, Commercial and Utility ● TRUenergy’s retail business sells solar PV (of up to 5kW) and solar hot water systems ● Significant growth in Solar PV due to various Government programs and lower costs ● Overview of TRUenergy’s proposed Mallee Solar Park – solar power station would be up to 180MW in capacity and consist of around 2.5 million panels ● Solar Thermal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – promising technology for large-scale applications, using the sun’s power to generate electricity by using lenses and reflectors to concentrate the sun’s energy – concentrated energy used to heat a fluid such as water or oil and uses the steam to drive a turbine – although currently more expensive than PV technology, it has the potential to integrate storage and can also be used to boost the output of existing coal and gas power plants ● Geothermal Power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – conventional technology in volcanic fields, future technology for “hot rocks” – TRUenergy has previously invested in the Paralana exploration activities – Geothermal has the potential for supplying baseload power in the long-term 	



Meeting Record

6.1	<p>Questions and Points of Clarification</p> <p>Q: What effect have the solar residential schemes over the last 10 years had on reduction in electricity demand? A: Significant, particularly over the last year.</p> <p>Q: What percentage of the TRUenergy retail base is solar? A: A small percentage – TRUenergy can provide more information on this at a later date.</p>	
7	<p>Georgina House - Other Business</p>	
7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AA reported that last Monday the CFS responded to a fire in the district and they were able to obtain an up to date weather report from the Waterloo Wind Farm straight away when it often takes 3-4 hours to get weather reports from the CFS. The report detailed wind direction and speed which was very useful to the fire-fighters. 	
7.2	<p>Waterloo Information Day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TRUenergy is planning a Community Information Day for May 2012. A possible venue is Gally's Meeting Place, Farrell Flat and possible dates include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thursday 17 May or - Friday 18 May or - Monday 21 May ● Consensus of the CLG was that Friday was not ideal day for an Information Day to be held ● 11am - 4pm and 5pm-7pm suggested times where people can drop in, meet the team and discuss the project, was considered a good idea. ● AA suggested potentially holding the Information Day at Marrabel and others agreed. 	
7.3	<p>University of Adelaide Student Study and Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A piece of work undertaken by an Adelaide University Student has been referred to by community members and media in recent weeks (including the statement by the Waterloo Concerned Citizens Group) ● Reference have been made to wind turbines having significant health impacts on residents near Waterloo ● TRUenergy wishes to outline some context around what has been stated ● TRUenergy approached the University of Adelaide and has been advised of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The study was a private study, not endorsed by the University of Adelaide - The study was made public without the student's consent - In the University's opinion, the study contained limitations and has not been peer reviewed ● The following statement has been prepared by Professor Mike Brooks, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University of Adelaide: <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Thank you for bringing this to the University's attention. We were unaware that such report had been posted on the Wind Watch website.</i></p> 	



Meeting Record

	<p><i>I have looked into this matter and found that the study in question was undertaken by a student as part of a minor thesis for his Masters by coursework. This was entirely the student's own project and not undertaken for or on behalf of the University. The summary report was provided by the student to a member of the Waterloo community who had participated in the student's survey. The student has confirmed that he neither intended nor authorised the wider dissemination of that report.</i></p> <p><i>As a project undertaken for a Masters by coursework, the study undoubtedly contains limitations and has not undergone any peer review. The University does not endorse its findings, and the references on the website to University staff were completely unauthorised. We will be issuing a request to the website owner to remove these associations to the University, and to take down the report as its unauthorised publication is an infringement of the student's copyright.</i></p> <p><i>Being a student project, copyright in the thesis and all project materials vests in the student. I am unable to provide you with any further material from the study as the student has advised that he does not wish to release any further material. We have responded in the same manner to requests from other interested parties.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● JF noted it was disappointing that the survey was made public without the student's knowledge 	
<p>7.4</p>	<p>Community Perceptions Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GH, on behalf of TRUenergy, distributed the latest TRUenergy Community Perception Survey to all members ● TRUenergy undertake community perception surveys periodically and these surveys are made publically available ● Copies are available on the TRUenergy website and are included in member information packs ● Another study that may be of interest was conducted by the CSIRO. A link to this study is http://www.csiro.au/Organisation-Structure/Flagships/Energy-Transformed-Flagship/Exploring-community-acceptance-of-rural-wind-farms-in-Australia.aspx ● GH invited all CLG members to consider: <i>“What sort of research matters to CLG members?”</i> ● Would members like to see the TRU Community Perception Survey repeated? ● Is this information of interest to members? ● Would members think a broader social environmental impact study would be of value to see how a wind farm can specifically impact or benefit a community? ● CLG Members were invited to think about this question and provide any feedback ahead of or at the next meeting. 	<p>CLG members to consider what sort of research is useful?</p>



Meeting Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● YC: Would like to lead and suggest a topic for the next CLG Meeting, discussing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Youth employment opportunities and initiatives – Transition from school to work – Strategies for creating transitional support ● YC: Really enjoyed all speakers so far, but feels the meetings are too rushed with too much to fit in and that meetings have taken on a negative tone ● Several members agreed that the meetings are becoming very negative and showed interest in looking at other aspects such as training and employment opportunities. Others said no point going over the same topics each meeting and important to move forward and discuss new topics ● Members agreed to discuss a positive topic at the next meeting, as suggested by YC 	GH to discuss topic with YC
8	<p>Topics for the Next Meeting(s)</p> <p>The CLG discussed and identified the following key topics as potential topics for future meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Discuss youth employment opportunities and initiatives, transition from school to work and related strategies, and how TRUenergy and other organisations can help (YC) ● CFS perspective on Wind farms (AA) ● How wind generated electricity fits into the grid and how this displaces other forms of electricity (DC) ● Community owned wind turbines (CE) 	
9	<p>Next Meeting and Close</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GH thanked all for their attendance ● Feedback welcome – please fill in feedback form if desired ● Minutes of this meeting will be distributed to all for review/comment and once finalised will be placed on the TRUenergy website ● Next CLG Meeting – Thursday June 7, 2012 – 4.30-6.30pm at Gally's Meeting Place, Farrell Flat ● Meeting Closed 	

Attachments include:

- TRUenergy Mid North Community Survey Summary
- Examples of Noise Monitoring Results
- Agenda for CLG Meeting #4

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.