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What we did: Repeat CWB survey from 2014

Feb 2016

SAMPLE: N = 500
100 x
- Dalby
- Chinchilla
- Miles / Wandoan
- Tara
- Roma

In town = Out of town

ABS representative
- age, gender, and employment
What we measured: Telephone survey

1. **Community Wellbeing**
   – 15 different dimensions

2. **Community Resilience**
   – Adapting and responding to change

3. **Attitudes and feelings towards CSG**

4. **Expected Future Community Wellbeing**
   
   • 120 questions
   • 30 minutes
Community Wellbeing: 2016 to 2014

Only five dimensions significantly different

Reduced dimensions
• Employment and job opportunities
• Community cohesion

Improved dimensions
• Roads
• Environmental management for the future
• Quality of environment (dust, noise, air)

Overall community wellbeing: Similar - no real change
Community wellbeing dimensions

- Environmental quality: 2014 - 3.5, 2016 - 3.9
- Environmental management: 2014 - 2.7, 2016 - 2.9*
- Roads: 2014 - 2.3, 2016 - 2.8*
- Community cohesion: 2014 - 3.6, 2016 - 3.4
- Employment and business opportunities: 2014 - 3.1*, 2016 - 2.2
- Overall community wellbeing: 2014 - 3.8, 2016 - 3.8

*statistical difference $p < .05$
Most important wellbeing dimensions: 2016
Future Community wellbeing – Most expect it to stay the same

In 2014
- Slightly negative outlook

Not borne out in 2016

In 2016
- Most people expect it to stay the same
- Still slightly negative
2016 Adapting to Change perceptions: Modest scores ...varies across the region

What’s important for feeling like adapting well to change

- Local planning
- Leadership
- Information access
- Working together
- Community commitment
- Being listened to
- Having a say
- Community trust
- Jobs, business opportunities
- Environmental management
Community perceptions: Adapting to CSG: 2014 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resisting it</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not coping</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only just coping</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting to the changes</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing into something different but better</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Differences between 2014 and 2016 were not significantly different.
2016 Community perceptions of adapting to CSG: varies across the region

Percentage of participants

- Resisting
- Not coping
- Only just coping
- Adapting to the changes
- Changing into something different but better

---

Dalby
- Resisting: 10%
- Not coping: 10%
- Only just coping: 20%
- Adapting to the changes: 30%
- Changing into something different but better: 40%

Chinchilla
- Resisting: 5%
- Not coping: 10%
- Only just coping: 40%
- Adapting to the changes: 50%
- Changing into something different but better: 60%

Miles
- Resisting: 2%
- Not coping: 10%
- Only just coping: 50%
- Adapting to the changes: 40%
- Changing into something different but better: 8%

Tara
- Resisting: 3%
- Not coping: 5%
- Only just coping: 30%
- Adapting to the changes: 30%
- Changing into something different but better: 12%

Roma
- Resisting: 4%
- Not coping: 10%
- Only just coping: 30%
- Adapting to the changes: 50%
- Changing into something different but better: 10%
2016: Coping with drought v coping with CSG

Perceived coping scores

- Dalby: CSG 3.0, Drought 3.0
- Chinchilla: CSG 3.1, Drought 3.1
- Miles: CSG 2.8, Drought 2.8
- Tara: CSG 3.1, Drought 2.5
- Western Downs: CSG 3.0, Drought 2.9
- Roma: CSG 3.3, Drought 2.9

Legend:
- CSG activities
- Drought
CSG Attitudes – still a range of views, slightly more negative in 2016
2016: Attitudes toward CSG – still vary across the region

The graph shows the percentage of participants' attitudes towards CSG in various regions: Dalby, Chinchilla, Miles, Tara, and Roma. The attitudes range from Reject to Embrace.

- **Reject**: The percentage of participants who reject CSG varies across the regions.
- **Tolerate**: The percentage of participants who tolerate CSG shows a significant difference between regions.
- **Accept**: The percentage of participants who accept CSG is highest in Dalby and lowest in Tara.
- **Approve**: The percentage of participants who approve of CSG is moderately high in Chinchilla and moderate in Miles.
- **Embrace**: The percentage of participants who embrace CSG is lowest in Dalby and highest in Roma.

The graph highlights that attitudes towards CSG are diverse and depend on the region.
2016: CSG Attitudes – Out-of-town residents still less positive

Percentage of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>In town</th>
<th>Out of town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerate</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feelings toward CSG development WD region: 2016

Agreement scores with feeling:

Positive feelings
- Pleased: 2.8
- Optimistic: 2.6
- Excited: 2.3

Negative feelings
- Angry: 2.7
- Worried: 3.1
- Sad: 2.8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community wellbeing dimensions</th>
<th>WD Region</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental quality</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income sufficiency</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built environment</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cohesion</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and facilities</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community trust</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making and citizen voice</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and business opportunities</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Farmers perceptions: 2014 and 2016

- Community wellbeing: 2014 - 3.8, 2016 - 3.9
- Community Resilience: 2014 - 3.0, 2016 - 3.0
- Attitudes and feelings toward CSG: 2014 - 2.6, 2016 - 2.6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Farmers - Active CSG Lease</th>
<th>Farmers - Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall community wellbeing</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected future community wellbeing</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental quality (dust, noise)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Coal Seam Gas companies ...can be trusted</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making and citizen voice (overall)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. Coal seam gas companies involve local residents ...</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings towards CSG development</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44. Satisfaction with dealings with CSG companies</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interesting observations ....for Q & A session

- Roma compares favourably to the Western Downs
- Changes in ‘in-town’ attitudes
- Farm attitudes not shifting
- What's driving the community cohesion decrease
- Information access, ‘having a say’ – still unsatisfactory
Thank You
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community wellbeing dimensions</th>
<th>WD Region</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental quality</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income sufficiency</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built environment</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cohesion</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and facilities</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community trust</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making and citizen voice</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and business opportunities</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Community wellbeing</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Community resilience</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected future wellbeing</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place attachment</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community attitudes and feelings towards CSG</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: No = No farm, Yes = Yes farm, H = Higher value, L = Lower value.*
Indicators of high community functioning: 2016

- Local planning
- Working together
- Being listened to
- Jobs, business
- Leadership
- Community trust
- Community commitment
- Information access
- Having a say
- Environmental management

Not coping ➡️ Only just coping ➡️ Resisting ➡️ Adapting ➡️ Transforming ➡️ High community functioning