

Gloucester Exploration Project COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CCC)

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	5 October 2017	10:00am
Venue:	Gloucester Arts Centre	
Present:	<i>Chairperson:</i> Lisa Andrews (LA) <i>GRL:</i> Bob Corbett (RC) <i>DRG:</i> Jaime Flynn (JF)	<i>Community Reps:</i> Ray Dawes (RD) Anthony Berecry (AB) Steve Robinson (SR) Trevor Sansom (TS) Advance Gloucester: Bill Williams (BW) <i>Minutes:</i> Melissa Williams
Apologies:	Brian Clifford and Chloe Grady	
Non-attendance:	Gloucester Business Chamber delegate	

1. Opening of Meeting

LA declared meeting open at 10:05am.

LA is an Independent Chairperson, appointed by the Minister for Industry to chair this committee.

Welcomed Jaime Flynn, Communication Advisor, Community & Government Services with the Department of Planning and Environment.

The Chair introduced Melissa Williams as the committee minute secretary.

The Chair asked each member to complete the attendance sheet and make any relevant changes to their contact details.

2. Apologies

Apologies from Brian Clifford and Chloe Grady

3. Confirmation of Previous Minutes

Previous minutes of 4th August 2017 accepted:

Moved: Bill Williams

Seconded: Ray Dawes

4. Business Arising

Action items 1, 3, 4 and 5 (from the previous meeting) were actioned in one e-mail from LA to members on 6th August 2017

- 1 LA to e-mail response from Mineral's Council to CCC
- 3 LA to send out copy of GRL's announcement regarding the partial relinquishment of EL6523 and include copy of map
- 4 LA to email CCC a copy of the Response to Submissions document
- 5 LA to send link of EIS to CCC

Action item 2 RC to arrange for hardcopy of the Response to Submission to be sent to the Gloucester Library and kept on file. Copy supplied 10 August.

Matters arising from previous minutes

AB raised the matter of the availability of data from monitoring sites. AB showed an example of the monitoring report provided to the Stratford CCC by Stratford Coal. RC reviewed the Stratford report advising that the nature of the data provided was likely a requirement of the Stratford development consent and that the data was probably also required to be placed on Stratford's website. Discussion took place regarding compliance monitoring undertaken by Stratford, monitoring undertaken by GRL and GRL's obligation to make results available. RC advised that unlike Stratford, GRL currently has no requirement to publically report monitoring results but that this would be expected as a condition of any development consent granted. RC also advised that baseline monitoring (surface water, groundwater, air quality and meteorology) is continuing.

With respect to dust monitoring results, RC advised that summaries are available from the company engaged to monitor dust at the GRL stations. As previously requested by AB, a plan showing the 8 deposited dust monitoring locations was shown to members. The two previous month's results were presented to the committee and RC informed the meeting that he also has rolling annual average results for some. RC stated that he would tabulate the monthly results and update and distribute a week prior to each CCC meeting so any questions can be submitted for response during the subsequent meeting. He also advised that he would provide the map of the locations to the Chair.

Over the July/August period, total insoluble solids (deposited dust) levels ranged from 0.3 – 1.8 g/m²/month with the mineral component of the dust ranging from approximately 30% – 85% - July (50 – 75%) and August (33 – 84%).

BW indicated that Stratford used to make this sort of historical information available on their website but are required to do so.

JF suggested that it may be helpful for GRL to consider how they make their reports available. RC advised that ash percentage data would be provided for deposited dust results.

RD stated he would like a breakdown of the particle size and would like to know the nature of the dust. RC advised that GRL does not undertake analyses other than to determine the overall % mineral content of the deposited dust. AB indicated that it was important to have a base level (which he acknowledged is available now) as it will be important for future comparison.

RC went on to explain that in addition to deposited dust, PM10 data is collected on a 6-day cycle at two sites and 24 hour PM10 and PM2.5 data is collected from another two sites. RC advised he would examine what baseline monitoring information could be provided and how it could be best presented. AB stated that he understood that it is 'a developing thing' and LA stated that there is no point in submitting copious amounts of data at this stage.

AB also expressed concern regarding dust outputs from the mine on top of environmental events such as bushfires which prompted TS to ask if there was a point or limit at which time operations would cease. RC informed the meeting that limits and

conditions under which they would or would not apply would be set out in any development consent granted. Real-time PM10 and PM2.5 trigger levels will be set which will indicate the need to implement additional dust control measures, or amend or shut down operations because of elevated dust concentrations in the air.

Noise monitoring was discussed and RC stated that GRL is not monitoring noise at this stage. Background noise was monitored for periods of time to identify the noise levels to be adopted in the EIS and noise assessment. Once operational, GRL will be required to undertake noise monitoring to verify operational compliance with the nominated limits.

TS asked RC if GRL monitor gas levels as there was concern at Duralie mine and the apparent smell of gas. RC informed the meeting that GRL does not monitor gas levels currently but will monitor fume levels during blasts. He also stated that the gas smell at Duralie is most likely sulphur as some coals in the Gloucester Basin, more commonly at the southern end, exhibit elevated sulphur levels. RC advised that he had never heard of problematic methane levels in open cut mines and that methane gas is odourless.

From General Business at the previous meeting regarding mining coal seams greater than 200 – 300 mm in thickness, AB questioned RC about mining coal seams less than 200mm in thickness and GRL's claim that the Rocky Hill Coal Project will produce 95% coking coal.. RC stated that the 200-300mm seam thickness referred to was used as the cut-off in reserve calculations and that if any thinner seam could be mined economically, it will be. RC also noted that any claims that GRL will be selectively mining coking quality coal and throwing away thermal coal e.g. as a means of increasing coking coal percentages, are incorrect, noting that the expected percentage of thermal and coking coal product were provided by a coal quality expert following lab analyses of core samples. RC also noted that all coal quality data was provided to DRG's coal quality personnel for assessment and that they agreed with GRL's determination. The DRG assessment is presented in its submission on the EIS, with further information on coal analyses etc presented in the RTS.

JL to provide the link to RTS for members' information.

5. Correspondence

- 4/8/17 – e-mail from Bob Corbett forwarding on the e-mail from NSW Mining regarding the grazing trial
- 6/8/17 – This information e-mailed to CCC members, together with the links to the major projects NSW website and the Rocky Hill Project website regarding response to submissions
- 25/9/17 – e-mail to members with the meeting notice and agenda for this meeting
- 25/9/17 – e-mail to Yancoal regarding the DPI Upper Hunter Grazing trial (copied to Bob Corbett and Anthony Berecny)
- 25/9/17 – e-mail from Yancoal (Alan Andrews) advising that he would discuss the matter with the broader team.

Correspondence accepted:

Moved: LA

Seconded: AB

6. Project Update RC provided the project update:

GRL

There is no change from an exploration perspective – no exploration activities undertaken or planned in the short-term and no reports submitted.

There are no issues in relation to land management.

The Rocky Hill Coal Project remains in the assessment phase with the Department of Planning and Environment. Over the period since the last CCC meeting, there have been some questions or aspects requiring clarification from the Department, each of which has been responded to or a response is being prepared.

SR queried the possibility of feeding back to the CCC any questions from the Department regarding the Rocky Hill EIS/RTS and GRL's response. Discussion was carried out regarding this. RC advised that as this interaction is a normal part of the assessment process and is often just a question of the Department better understanding some matter, GRL would not be feeding them to the CCC. Other areas where a formal response to comments received from a Department was submitted by GRL are placed on the DPE website and are available for scrutiny by the CCC and community in general. JF stated that information continues to be made available through the major projects website. JF stated that DPE continues to coordinate with other agencies where additional information is required. RC informed the meeting that there is the ability to receive notifications from the DPE's website when there is new information available.

RD asked JF if the Department were interested in local atmospheric conditions. RD noted that inversion levels are not well understood by most people; that there are huge variations in the Gloucester Valley and concerns regarding environmental events and inversion levels. RC stated that GRL had been monitoring temperature at various elevations for a number of years and that this information had been used to develop an estimate of frequency of occurrence of atmospheric stability classes by period of day and season that was presented in the RTS (see RTS Section 2.35.5.1). RC also noted that development consents routinely require monitoring of lapse rates and that the lapse rates applying to compliance noise monitoring are generally more reflective of local conditions than had generally been the case previously. RD stated that he didn't believe the EPA's computer modelling has the Gloucester Valley accurately portrayed. JF advised that the EPA may be able to provide more information about noise monitoring standards and could try and find information or a person for RD to speak with. The Chair advised that someone from the EPA has presented at a previous CCC.

RD questioned the possibility of having an EPA expert present to the CCC on the issue of atmospheric conditions and the concerns expressed above. RC advised that this kind of information/subject is very technical and he could not see a lot of benefit in seeking advice from such an expert until such time as an approval is granted (and approval conditions are known).

**7. General
Business**

BW asked RC if water testing was to be carried out on the Avon River, even in periods of dry (as we are experiencing currently). RC stated that routine monthly water testing is carried out independent of flow conditions, i.e. where water is present at the nominated sampling point.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 11:07am with the chair thanking CCC members for their contribution.

NEXT MEETING: 1st December 2017

Action Items

ITEM	ISSUE	RESPONSIBILITY
1	Email map with location of monitors	RC/LA
2	Link providing DRG's response to the amended Rocky Hill EIS	JF
3	Major Project website – direct link to Rocky Hill project. (Members may subscribe to in order to receive notifications when a change to this page occurs.)	JF
4	Identify section of response to submissions pertaining to inversion occurrence/noise	RC

Item 2: Link to DRG's response

<https://majorprojects.accelo.com/public/718591635a502050fc644e993a026687/DRE%20Response%20Amended%20Rocky%20Hill%20Coal%20Project.pdf>

Item 3: Link to DP&E's major project website RHCP updates:

http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=search&page_id=&search=Rocky+Hill&authority_id=&search_site_type_id=&reference_table=&status_id=&decider=&from_date=&to_date=&x=0&y=0