

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF GLOUCESTER EXPLORATION
PROJECT, COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE,
HELD AT SCHOOL OF SCHOOL OF ARTS
DENISON STREET, GLOUCESTER
ON 21 FEBRUARY 2013**

PRESENT: Mr Terrence Healey, CHAIRMAN
Mr Grant Polwarth, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Mr Bob Corbett, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Mrs Terry Hardwick
Mr Trevor Sansom
Mr Ray Dawes
Dr Steve Robinson
Ms Julie Moloney, NSW TRADE & INVESTMENT (DIVISION
FOR RESOURCES AND ENERGY)
Cr Karen Hutchinson, GREAT LAKES COUNCIL
Mr Ian Jackson
Mr Tony Tersteeg
Dr Gerald McCalden

APOLOGIES: Mr Graham Holley, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Mr Graham Gardner, GLOUCESTER SHIRE COUNCIL

Dr Gerald McCalden gave his belated apology for the meeting 13
December 2012

**OPENING OF
MEETING:** Mr Healey declared the meeting open at 10.02 am.

**CONFIRMATION
OF MINUTES OF
LAST MEETING:**

Moved: Mr Ray Dawes
Seconded: Mr Bob Corbett

**BUSINESS
ARISING FROM
THE MINUTES:**

Page 1 –

Ray Dawes asked if Grant Polwarth was aware AGL are buying a sniffer to check on methane levels and wondered if the two (2) organisations could co-ordinate the data collection and do dust monitoring at the same time?

Grant Polwarth unaware AGL doing this and would have a discussion with AGL about it.

Page 4

Ian Jackson asked for clarification if the prospect for jobs was for farming or mining? Grant Polwarth confirmed it is for both.

Trevor Sansom raised a concern in relation to the condition of the rental properties. Grant confirmed the process of renting and management of the properties is through Webb Bros who have property management specialists who go through the process of advertising, checking of tenants and putting it all in place. Tenancy Agreements apply to the house and some yards and land. It is a case by case situation.

Dr Gerald McCalden noted words missing from the Confirmation of Minutes dated 13 December 2012 and this is to be amended to read:

“Trevor Sansom spoke about the state of the rental properties. Grant advised *the majority of properties are* going through a Real Estate Agent, however GP took the comments on board.”

CORRESPONDENCE: Incoming:

Email from AGL advising the dates of their meetings so as to help co-ordinate meeting dates.

PROJECT UPDATE BY GRANT POLWARTH

- 1 GRL have not conducted any exploration since the last CCC meeting. GRL are concentrating on the Rocky Hill project.
- 2 The EIS has been lodged. As at today's date GRL are waiting some final comments from some of the agencies and are endeavouring to get the project on public exhibition as soon as possible. As to timing it is in the hands of the Department.
- 3 Tony Teerstge commented about the timing for the exhibition period and he understands the Council have requested an extension. Would GRL support that?

Grant confirmed the date is not up to them but thinks it is somewhere between 4 – 8 weeks and recent history suggests most projects are going for the extension. GRL will fit in with what the Department of Planning indicates and if it is eight (8) weeks, that is fine with GRL.

Karen Hutchinson stated she doesn't like the exhibition period too long because people put off looking at the EIS.

Tony Teerstge stated the applications are very large and to give it proper credibility and research he doesn't think eight (8) weeks is long enough for research etc to be done.

General discussion took place in regard to the EIS exhibition time.

- 4 Generally, tree watering not required, slashing now, continuing with planting and general maintenance mode around the tree screening that has been done.
- 5 Job applications continue to flow in. A lot of people who travel away are now contacting GRL to come to the area.
- 6 Terrence Healey asked if a copy of the EIS has been provided as requested by Ray Dawes? Grant advised they are not able to provide it yet as it is not on public exhibition. When it does go on public exhibition he will be able to supply a copy.

**GENERAL
BUSINESS:**

- 1 Steve Robinson asked if the CCC, considering the level of expertise on the Committee, could be sent a preliminary copy of the EIS from the Minister. Terrence Healey advised he saw difficulty with this as there is no mandate to ask the Minister to include the CCC in any discussion.

Julie Moloney agreed with the level of expertise on the Committee. However, with regard to the draft EIS, it is up to the Department of Planning. The division of Resources and Energy was asked for an adequacy review of this EIS prior to Christmas 2012. Julie's view is that the opportunity to have a look at the draft EIS has actually passed because as far as she is aware adequacy was done last year.

Julie Moloney further advised that with adequacy, it is not about whether or not information in this EIS is technically sound, it is about whether or not the issues are covered

Further discussion took place in relation to the CCC's role.

Terrence Healey asked if the Committee would like him to write to the respective Ministers in both Planning and Minister Resources and point out the views of the Committee?

Bob Corbett commented this group has expertise but firstly not all CCC's have the level of expertise this group has and secondly not all CCC's always exist in this forum.

Julie Moloney commented that this is an exploration CCC set up by the Minister for Mineral Resources for the exploration project and it is appropriate for individual members of the CCC to write to relevant Ministers with their concerns or suggestions but not sure that as a Committee set up by the Minister for Mineral Resources it is appropriate for the Chair of this Committee to write to other Ministers. This is a Ministerial Committee for a specific project.

- 2 Karen Hutchinson asked if when the consent comes through to start mining would there be a new CCC for mining? Julie Moloney advised yes. Discussion took place as to what would happen with the other EL's under this CCC? It will essentially be up to the Minister. Terrence Healey stated that he thinks it will continue as a matter of law until such time as the Company relinquishes it's EL's on the balance of those areas they have been granted or they're refused or abandoned etc.

Julie Moloney quoted from the Charter in regards to dissolving the Committee:

“The Gloucester Exploration Project CCC is a sunset committee. It dissolves at the end of the exploration licences or at the discretion of the Minister for Mineral Resources.”

- 3 Karen Hutchinson asked if the new Legislation was going to effect other sites? GRL not sure. Terrence Healey stated that it would require Cabinet to specifically designate it to apply to areas outside those have already been identified for CSG matters.
- 4 Karen Hutchinson asked if there is a criteria the companies have to abide by in the EIS? Grant Polwarth advised yes. Julie Moloney advised the DGR's for the EIS outline what the Department of Planning would expect to be assessed. Any project approval will be based on the information, the facts of science and the commitment made in the EIS. If the project is approved the EIS says that dust levels will not exceed whatever number, if those levels exceed the number the mine can be shut down until that issue is dealt with and managed to bring it back into line with what the EIS says.
- 5 Karen Hutchinson asked who in the Department reads the EIS? Julie Moloney advised that she reads the EIS and co-

ordinates her division's comments into planning on EIS's. Each agency will have its expertise and responsibilities.

- 6 Discussion took place in relation to the studies being undertaken and if they are adequate enough. Some members don't think the studies are adequate enough. Grant Polwarth commented to the Committee that given none of the studies are in the public domain yet that the comment that they are inadequate is unfair. Grant is looking forward to the Committee being able to read the EIS and then happy to discuss with the Committee after that. Current comments are premature.
- 7 Ian Jackson asked if once the submission period is over is there a time frame that GRL has to answer the submissions. What time line would GRL be looking at to get the coal mine up and running?

Grant Polwarth advised GRL made a commitment to get on with business so both GRL and the community have some surety. GRL are going through the process as quickly as they can giving it the due respect and detail that it needs.

Bob Corbett answered that there is a defined period for responding to submissions. What generally happens is that it depends on the magnitude and the nature of the submissions as to what reasonable time frame is set.

Ian Jackson is concerned that if the GRL mine is granted approval and if AGL get preference then it is not in the fairness of residents to have to wait 20 years for AGL to extract the gas and GRL start mining. This is a concern to residents.

Bob Corbett responded that should an approval be granted it has a sunset clause in it that you have a duration attached to the grant and if you don't act on it within five (5) years it lapses anyway so it would not be feasible or possible that GRL would get an approval and then have to sit back and couldn't do anything for 20 years because the approval would lapse.

Julie Moloney also advised that it is a condition of the exploration titles for this project and the AGL project that the companies co-operate.

Ian Jackson asked if the Petroleum Licence takes preference over the Coal Licence? Julie Moloney advised 'no'.

General discussion took place in respect to timelines.

- 8 Terrence Healey asked if AGL has exploration licences for gas over GRL owned land? Grant Polwarth advised 'yes'. Discussion took place in respect to GRL being the landowner as well as a coal exploration company.
- 9 Ray Dawes asked if the two companies on the same area do conditions applied by Planning automatically flow through to the second company or on the two companies.

Julie advised that it would flow through per se but she should expect that under planning both companies would have the same sort of condition of co-operation.

Bob Corbett commented that the conditions that apply to company "A" would then flow through to company "B" even if company "B" hasn't got approval yet.

Ray Dawes commented that this is a concern to the residents.

Further discussion took place.

- 10 Tony Teerstge commented that when a complaint is made for, say, noise who will take responsibility. Each company will blame the other company. Bob Corbett explained how this is monitored these days and further discussion took place in this regard.

- 11 Next meeting Friday 3 May 2013 at 10.00 am

Meeting closed at 11.10 am.