

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF GLOUCESTER EXPLORATION
PROJECT, COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE,
HELD AT SCHOOL OF SCHOOL OF ARTS
DENISON STREET, GLOUCESTER
ON 3 MAY 2013**

PRESENT: Mr Terrence Healey, CHAIRMAN
Mr Grant Polwarth, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Mr Bob Corbett, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Mr Trevor Sansom
Dr Steve Robinson
Ms Julie Moloney, NSW TRADE & INVESTMENT (DIVISION
OF RESOURCES AND ENERGY)
Mr Ian Jackson
Mr Tony Tersteeg
Dr Gerald McCalden

APOLOGIES: Mr Graham Holley, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Mr Graham Gardner, GLOUCESTER SHIRE COUNCIL
Cr Karen Hutchinson, GREAT LAKES COUNCIL
Mr Ray Dawes
Mrs Terry Hardwick

**OPENING OF
MEETING:** Mr Healey declared the meeting open at 10.06 am.

**CONFIRMATION
OF MINUTES OF
LAST MEETING:** The correct spelling of Tony Tersteeg was noted.

Bob Corbett asked Julie Moloney if clause paragraph 2 in clause 9 was worded correctly. Julie advised "yes".

Moved: Mr Bob Corbett
Seconded: Mr Trevor Sansom

**BUSINESS
ARISING FROM
THE MINUTES:**

Ian Jackson asked how much input AGL has in respect to cumulative impacts? The impact of GRL is not clear regarding the operations of the company eg noise and size of drill rigs etc?

Terrence Healey told Ian Jackson that his question is a good one but doesn't think the Company can answer the question and he may address his concerns to the Department of Planning.

Bob Corbett advised that it is a requirement of the EIS to address cumulative noise. The EIS looks at noise alone and in conjunction with AGL and Stratford and then compares them. GRL have definitely looked a cumulative noise.

Grant Polwarth advised the noise associated with GRL's operations is plant location specific. Hopefully GRL will be able to give more detail once the EIS is on public exhibition.

Further discussion took place in respect to noise issues and the cumulative impact.

CORRESPONDENCE: Incoming:

Email from Dr Stephen Robinson to Terrence Healey dated 4 March 2013 and his reply.

PROJECT UPDATE BY GRANT POLWARTH

- 1 GRL have not conducted any exploration since the last CCC meeting.
- 2 EL 6523 and 6563 have been renewed. EL 6563 was for an area of 2964 hectares which flanks the western margin of the Gloucester basin and is essentially unchanged. EL 6523 which is the one within which the Rocky Hill project is located was renewed for an area of 3559 hectares. He reminded the Committee that in February last year they announced they were going to voluntarily relinquish 1966 hectares of that EL which was essentially an area was in close proximity to Gloucester along the western flood-plains and along the Gloucester river.
- 3 Remain awaiting public exhibition of the EIS and in the meantime GRL have been carrying on tree planting, maintenance and farming activities.
- 4 Tony Tersteeg asked if the exploration lease running along the Bucketts Way down south had found any significant resource there? Grant advised there was some limited exploration in that area to understand the geology and see what is there. That was conducted under a **Surface Disturbance Notice** through the Department. There is coal

there but it requires further exploration to see what that deposit looks like.

- 5 Dr Gerald McCalden asked which seams they are? Grant Polwarth advised in the Woods Road area typically you find Bindaboo and Deards and in the south western exploration area we believe we intercepted the Wisemanel and Clareval seams.

**GENERAL
BUSINESS:**

- 1 Steve Robinson asked Julie Moloney to make comment about the previous practices of Companies being asked to relinquish a portion of their area, stating that it seems that none of EL 6563 has been relinquished.

Julie Moloney commented that it is a requirement that Companies relinquish a percentage of their EL. If they don't wish to do that they have to justify why they require the whole of the EL.

Steve Robinson asked if GRL had done that through the Department. Julie advised she isn't involved in the renewal process so she can't specifically answer that but the fact that it has been renewed then the argument put forward by the Company to renew the whole area must have been accepted.

Steve Robinson asked if that information could be found on the website? Julie Moloney advised 'no' and that it would be commercial confidence.

Steve Robinson stated that it seems that the Company are being given unfair leniency. The public is being asked to hang on and hang on.

Julie Moloney stated that this exploration Company is absolutely being treated in the renewal process exactly the same and given exactly the same opportunity as every other exploration Company in the State. This Company is not receiving special treatment.

Tony Tersteeg stated the community side of this is that these EL's were part of Gloucester Coal's original exploration licence, then they went to Stratford who gave them up and now GRL have taken them up. If they relinquish part of the EL there is nothing to stop another Company coming along and taking them on again.

Julie Moloney replied that Gloucester Coal did hold Exploration Licences over extensive areas of Gloucester Basin and over time they were relinquished. Some of those original titles are from the 70's era and that was the length of time it took for them to do their exploration and relinquish areas. The difference now to when the EL's were originally granted to GRL was that this area was not in a minerals allocation area. The whole of New South Wales is now in a minerals allocation area for coal. What that means, is that should areas be relinquished then a Company can't just put in an application for the area because it is for coal. They have to get pre-approval and they are required to get the Minister's consent. So, when the area has been relinquished, another Company can't just turn around and say they are interested in it, they have to go through the pre-approval process. If the Minister is considering giving his consent there is now what is called a 'Public Exposure Test'. Ads are put in the newspaper that will alert interested parties to the fact that the Minister is considering a direct allocation and asking for other interested parties to make their interests known.

- 2 Ian Jackson raised the point that when people purchased property it didn't show up in any searches done against the property. Julie Moloney confirmed there is a conveyancing process. The Department has also provided a service for landowners and potential purchasers.
- 3 Julie Moloney advised the conditions of the two (2) renewed EL's are on the Departments website in the section called DIGS database. Please contact Julie if you have any difficulty finding this.
- 4 Gerald McCalden raised the fact that the EIS was supposed to go on exhibition yesterday (2 May 2013) but has been postponed, what is the reason.

Grant Polwarth stated that he thinks that date was incorrectly reported as GRL have not been formally informed that it was going on exhibition on that date.

Gerald McCalden and Ian Jackson stated that Gloucester Shire Council advised that it would be. Gerald McCalden made reference to timing of the CCC meeting coinciding with the public exhibition period.

Grant Polwarth stated that this CCC date was planned well in advance and that GRL have not been informed as to the date of public exhibition and although they hoped it would be on public exhibition by now, it isn't and it is out of GRL's hands.

Terrence Healey asked if Ian Jackson or anyone from the Council has written or is going to write to the Minister for Planning about the delay? Ian Jackson replied “not recently, as they thought it would be out yesterday”.

Grant Polwarth confirmed that for the record, the Company is awaiting notification from the Department of Planning of when the project will go on public exhibition.

Terrence Healey noted from the Chair’s position the emotional impact on the community because of the delay and at the same time the commercial interest of the Company would also be keen to get some indication.

- 5 Trevor Sansom advised it came up at the meeting last night about the purpose of the tree planting along the road. People are concerned because they think it will be like driving down an avenue of trees and you won’t be able to see the Bucketts anymore. He also asked if it is a requirement.

Grant confirmed the Bucketts are on the other side to the tree planting and the tree planting is a combination of reasons, being:

- a as part of the EIS they engaged visual amenities specialist which included some recommendations and advice on how to soften various visual aspects;
- b it is from an ecological point of view as flora and fauna corridors;
- c as landowners GRL believes it is a proactive approach to the process.

There is no requirement to plant trees. Grant stated that he found that the premise that it is in some way a negative thing to plant trees confusing as on one hand they are told by certain parts of the community how wonderful they look and now there is objection.

Trevor Sansom stated that at the Council meeting discussion took place about if the trees were planted to hide the mess when the mine is started, the concern being an avenue of trees and the way the trees were planted in clumps.

Bob Corbett explained the intent of planting, that the density of the planting does change in the rows as you move further from the roads and that over time as some species die out it will end up being an open woodland similar to what you

would naturally see. There are a whole range of species planted and if you look at them closely you will note the species mix changes as you get further back from the road as the spacing opens up. There has been a lot of planning to ultimately achieve a positive result.

Steve Robinson confirmed it was he who raised the tree planting issue at the Council meeting. Steve Robinson further spoke about the tree planting and the objection of the tunnel of trees planted and de-valuing the tourist area.

Grant Polwarth stated the area of trees that is being spoken about is a length of 500 metres. Grant confirmed they will always respect people's opinions. The planting of the trees came about after serious consideration and as part of the socio-economic impact assessment and some feedback from the community. GRL receive feedback when walking down the street from people, and even from people who may not be in favour of the mine have commended GRL on the tree planting and that shows there is a diversity of views on the tree planting.

- 6 Bob Corbett advised that on the Rocky Hill website they have contact details of the committee members. Do people who are not currently on the website have any a problem with their email contact on the website?

No objection.

- 8 Bob Corbett requested the Minutes be circulated earlier.

Next meeting Friday 5 July 2013 at 10.00 am

Meeting closed at 11.00 am.