

MEETING MINUTES

Central North West Stakeholder Reference Group

Meeting #2

Date	8 June 2023
Time	11:00 am-1:00pm
Presenters	Stewart Sharples (SS) Charlie McAlister (CM) Alicia Leis (AL)
Location	Cradle Coast Authority Chambers, Burnie

Attendees

Name	Organisation
Romy Greiner	Community Member
Elise Kaine	Community Member
Sandra Ayton	Central Coast Council
Alan Bradford (online)	Advance West North West
Greg Fenwick	Kentish and Latrobe Councils
Mathew Skirving (online)	Devonport Council
Karina Dambergs	Northern Tasmania Development Corporation
Spencer Gibbs (proxy)	Cradle Coast Authority
James McKee (proxy) (online)	Regional Development Australia Tasmania

Apologies

Name	Organisation
Kate O'Sullivan	Community Member
Enya Willis	Community Member
Iona Flett	Cradle Coast Authority
Veronica Terry	Regional Development Tasmania Australia

Agenda

Ref no.	Item
1.0	Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address outstanding group administrative items • Overview of the Mapping Important Places session
2.0	Overview – ReCFIT’s Internal Work to Inform REZ
3.0	Understanding North West Community Values <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does participatory mapping achieve? • Testing and trailing the online mapping tool
4.0	Short Break
5.0	Reviewing the Mapping Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the mapping tool functionality • Review the engagement approach for public participation
6.0	Next Steps and Meeting Close <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next SRG session • Mapping Important Places for public release

Minutes

Ref no.	Item
1.0	<p>Welcome and acknowledgment of Country</p> <p>AL acknowledged country. AL introduced the session and those who were participating online.</p> <p>AL and SS facilitated discussion regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRG endorsing the terms of reference, subject to consideration of the detailed feedback provided by a member on the Scope • The SRG noted that feedback had been received on the draft minutes from session one and offered that feedback would be incorporated by ReCFIT in the final minutes, prior to being published on the website. • The process of providing draft minutes after each session for one round of feedback prior to endorsing the minutes at the following session, was agreed. • A member noted that they had met with staff from UTAS and passed on to the group that there was interest from UTAS staff to document the process being followed in the event it becomes a model for other jurisdictions to follow. <p>Consultation fatigue was raised again and briefly discussed with the group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members noted that there is potential for there to be consultation fatigue in the north west, resulting from multiple government consultation processes for specific projects. • The group noted that it is important for this REZ-engagement process to clearly communicate to the community what will happen with the material received including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who will be making decisions and how will feedback be considered, and how is this fed back into community? - There is a need to ensure people know this engagement exercise is genuine and the feedback will be used in making decisions.

2.0

Overview – ReCFIT’s Internal Work to Inform REZ

- SS provided an introduction to the exploratory work occurring internally to identify and compare options for REZ. This systematic approach will provide a better understanding of spatial impacts to inform REZ policy development, in line with multi-criteria assessments and applicable geographical information.
- These assessments include investigating wind resource, environmental, heritage and land use - potential land use conflict or impacts on sites of environmental and heritage value, cost-effectiveness - proximity to existing transmission infrastructure, and investor interest (ROI).
- SS described that over 380 individual spatial features from more than 60 spatial data layers have formed the analysis so far. This is further informed by an intergovernmental working group consisting of representatives from:
 - Environment
 - Parks & Wildlife
 - Mining
 - Forestry
 - Planning
 - Heritage.
- SS noted that ReCFIT is currently validating data from the analysis and a key component of this piece of work is the considerations of community values and undertaking the mapping important places initiative.
- The outcome of this analysis is expected by August this year and ReCFIT intends to have a consultation period on the outcomes at this time.

3.0	<p>Understanding North West Community Values</p> <p>While talking through and demonstrating the digital mapping tool, CM briefly described what the mapping sets out to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping Important Places is a participatory mapping approach, which forms the relationship between place/sense of place and local community values • Collecting input from community via the mapping exercise will provide a unique visual representation and qualitative data of what the north west perceives as their place and identify features of significance/importance within it. • The tool also allows users to identify areas where they believe renewables would be best located. <p>CM described the functions and features available and described to the SRG that the test environment is missing some features.</p> <p>AL requested that as the group works through the tool, members record all their feedback in terms of useability, functionality and approaches to communicating the tool, its purpose, and ways to reach the north west for community.</p> <p>The SRG group tested and trialled the digital mapping tool.</p>
4.0	<p>10 min break</p>
5.0	<p>Reviewing the Mapping Process Features and Functionality of the Tool</p> <p>After a short break, AL requested feedback from the group about the functionality of the digital mapping tool.</p> <p>The group provided the following feedback on the tool's features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderation of comments, responding to comments and weighing qualitative responses and evidence-based comments, and subjective vs objective input needs consideration • The ability to draw shapes and identify areas on the map, beyond a single-point pin would be useful • The ability to show multiple values (categories) for a single pin, was requested • An explainer video or tutorial to assist community members in using the mapping tool, and clear guidelines and instructions to assist users, is required • Can 'agriculture' be considered as a category option? • Concerns about lower engagement and participation if registration is required. Suggestion to allow for users to provide details as optional, after completing the exercise • Use accessible language and avoid generic prompts • Ensure the tool is mobile-friendly for users. <p>The following questions were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the tool handle buffer zones for residents scattered across the landscape?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tool Usage: Will the tool be used for purposes other than public/participatory mapping? • What incentives are provided to encourage participation? <p>The below feedback was raised regarding map features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include planning zones and reserves as an embedded overlay • Include spatial references like rivers and roads • Be cautious about the complexity of the map and aim for simplicity in questions and map design • Clearly define the desired data sets to help determine the extent of overlays • Suggestion to involve an informed group in assessing suitable locations after considering overlays and consultation • Introduce the ability to view different layers (e.g. soils, slope, agriculture land use) • Explore accessing additional data sets, such as viticulture/wine areas and non-government data. <p>Other notes raised by the group include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of potential bias and misuse of the tool by certain groups • How will setbacks be considered to protect key areas? • Option to use overlays to toggle multiple layers on/off • Consider the needs of advanced and less advanced users • Provide an explanation as to why some overlays are given more emphasis than others (e.g. AEMO and cultural overlays) • Clarify that placing a pin does not necessarily exclude renewables from being built in that spot. Outline these appropriate expectations in the instructions • Suggestion to conduct focus groups, including non-digital users, to test data results and compare quantitative and qualitative data.
5.1	<p>Reviewing the Mapping Process</p> <p>Engagement Approach and Communicating the Tool</p> <p>AL requested feedback from the group to suggest communicating the tool, its roll-out and engagement approach in the north west.</p> <p>Members provided the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital and non-digital consultation options for participation will be key to increased reach and to being inclusive • Some places to provide hard copies of the mapping exercise, pending resourcing and appetite should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood houses • Libraries • Youth forums to involve young people <p>Some groups to approach and brief about the tool were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism e.g. central coast tourism operators • Agriculture • Industry briefings • Regional planning groups

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder meetings preferred rather than broad public consultation Ask stakeholders to distribute the tool to their members/networks <p>Broadcasting the tool and how it presents across the north west:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-channel advertising is required A targeted approach to the roll-out is important Set a target number of responses for baseline When the map is published, there will be a new flood of engagement. It will be important to have a defensible process so people can not argue after it is published that they didn't have a chance to be consulted How can the community build in depth knowledge and understanding? Explain to people what will happen with their input Explain that the mapping will not be statistically significant or relevant and that it is primarily an engagement exercise How will data-bias be managed? The Circular Head region has conducted detailed work and research to inform visual amenity priorities – can this be incorporated? How do we ensure other areas receive this same opportunity? Could we consider the second round of consultation at a closer scale? Will there be engagement with the Tasmanian planning process review? Iterative/adaptive process to improve data captured. <p>SS committed that changes made to the tool and its presentation would be communicated to the SRG ahead of public release.</p>
6.0	<p>Next Steps and Meeting Close</p> <p>AL thanked everyone for the comprehensive feedback on the mapping tool and for informing the next steps for ReCFIT to prepare the mapping exercise for public release.</p> <p>SS and CM offered that the Minutes from the first SRG and the Terms of Reference will be updated to reflect the feedback round and placed on the website.</p> <p>SS briefly mentioned the next session will be about Community Benefit Sharing as we look toward understanding what the SRG and broader community's views and ideas are about how this can work best for the north west.</p> <p>AL closed the meeting.</p>

Actions

No.	Action	Owner	Due
1	Send Minutes to SRG for one round of feedback	ReCFIT	30 June 2023
2	Provide the Mapping link and supporting information to the SRG on the go live date, for distribution to SRG networks	ReCFIT	30 June 2023