

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF GLOUCESTER EXPLORATION
PROJECT, COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE,
HELD AT SCHOOL OF SCHOOL OF ARTS
DENISON STREET, GLOUCESTER
ON 14 MARCH 2014

PRESENT: Mr Terrence Healey, CHAIRMAN
Mr Bob Corbett, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Ms Julie Moloney, NSW TRADE & INVESTMENT
(DIVISION OF RESOURCES AND ENERGY)
Dr Gerald McCalden
Ian Jackson
Graham Holley, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Ray Dawes.
Mr Trevor Sansom
Ms Sarah Jardine, NSW TRADE & INVESTMENT
(DIVISION OF RESOURCES AND ENERGY)
Tony Tersteeg.

APOLOGIES: Mr Grant Polwarth, GLOUCESTER RESOURCES LIMITED
Dr Steve Robinson.

**NON-
ATTENDANCE** Mr Graham Gardner, GLOUCESTER SHIRE COUNCIL
Karen Hutchinson, GREAT LAKES COUNCIL

Discussion took place in respect to non-attendance and Mr Healey confirmed he would write to Gloucester Council to re-invite them to attend meetings.

Trevor Sansom stated Taree Council should be invited to the meetings. Discussion took place and that it is not in the project area but peripheral.

**OPENING OF
MEETING:** Mr Healey declared the meeting open at 10.10 am.

Julie Moloney introduced Sarah Jardine to the Committee Members.

Mr Healey welcomed Sarah Jardine.

Sarah Jardine will be based in Gloucester a few days per week to assist with any enquiries. Sarah Jardine gave an overview of her role and advised the Gloucester Project website is:

<http://www.resources.nsw.gov.au/community-information/gloucester-communications-project>

**CONFIRMATION
OF MINUTES OF
LAST MEETING:**

Amendments to the Minutes of 29 March 2014:

Page 2, last sentence:

The words “nothing new will come out of it” to be deleted and the words “nothing new to be expected.” inserted.

Page 3, paragraph 5:

The words “and there is a subsequent opportunity for comment.” be deleted.

Mr Healey asked if the Department of Planning are the ones to put the matter out and then opportunity of public comment?

Julie Moloney advised:

- all stakeholders and the community were able to submit comments regarding the EIS to Department of Planning;
- comments are on the Department of Planning website;
- responses by the company are put on the Department of Planning’s website;
- government agencies have an opportunity to respond to the Response to Submissions.
- at any time individuals are able to write to the Department of Planning regarding any project. To the best of Julie’s knowledge there is no formal process.

Bob Corbett advised the next formal process where people have an opportunity to write to government is the Planning Assessment Commission (PAC) hearing. Julie agreed.

Julie Moloney advised the PAC have their own website. Google NSW PAC and you will find their website. The website has:

- Referrals from Minister for Planning;
- PAC Hearings;
- Reports associated with the PAC.

The Planning website and PAC website are linked to each other.

Ian Jackson referred to an email he sent with some queries as to the last meeting if there were changes to the EIS whether they would be on public submission for comment.

Mr Healey asked Julie Moloney to comment.

Julie advised:

- The response to submissions can add weight to that document
- If project was to change substantially it would probably be a requirement to submit a preferred project report and that is available for comment.
- Anybody at any time can write to various agencies including the Department of Planning and Infrastructure or their Minister to raise issues, but no formal process in that regard.
- Next formal process will be a referral to the PAC which is expected for this project.

Bob Corbett advised anyone who made a submission will be formally advised by the PAC or Department of Planning.

Julie Moloney pointed out that:

- All documents and commitment that a company makes going through an approval process eg EIS, Response to Submissions, form the key basis for any conditions of approval should the project be approved;
- If project is approved and there is a commitment in the EIS or Response to Submissions that is not undertaken by the company, they can be in breach of their conditions.

Further discussion took place.

Moved: Bob Corbett
Seconded: Ian Jackson

**BUSINESS
ARISING FROM**

THE MINUTES: Ray Dawes asked how much longer will the approval process take?

Discussion took place that no-one really knows but Bob Corbett will make comment in the Project Update.

CORRESPONDENCE: Nil.

PROJECT UPDATE BY BOB CORBETT

- 1 Currently reviewing geological model of the Woods Road area and the area down to the south west.
- 2 Looking at possibly doing more regional exploration later in the year to assess resources and reserves in those areas of interests.
- 3 GRL have not finalised any plans and have not submitted anything to the Department. When more information becomes available it will be provided to the committee.
- 4 Continue to work on the responses to the 1,600 submissions received.

Ray Dawes asked if individual replies would be made to submissions?

Bob Corbett advised 'no' and discussion took place in the approach adopted by GRL.

Mr Healey asked Bob Corbett if the summary is purely for the Department. Bob Corbett advised the whole response document is for the Department.

Mr Healey asked if the summary will be made public? Bob Corbett advised the whole document will be released by the Department.

Bob Corbett advised the simple way to explain the process is:

- Exhibition – GRL get submissions in and respond to the submissions.
- Department of Planning then look at impact statement, various submissions made by people, GRL's response to those submissions.

- Department of Planning then prepare a preliminary Assessment Report. That report goes on Department of Planning website and provided to Planning Assessment Commission. A public hearing would be held for people to have their say to the Commissioners.
- Commissioners then form an opinion.
- Then, goes back to Department of Planning
- Department of Planning then produce a final assessment report.
- Then goes back to Planning Assessment Commission who will give development consent or refuse the application.

**GENERAL
BUSINESS:**

Ian Jackson asked if still hoping for a result by the end of the year or early next year? He is concerned the coal price is dropping and the worry is still hanging around resident's necks while gets extended and extended.

Bob Corbett confirmed GRL are not doing anything to delay process. Would like done as quickly as possible for the benefit of investors and appreciate the uncertainty and cause for concern in community. That is why GRL is answering submissions comprehensively as it minimises the likely time in the next stage.

Gerald McCalden commented on the description of the process and that the PAC process ensures that no merits appeal will be possible on the decision. Discussion took place in respect to no appeal on the merit of the project however it is possible to appeal on a point of law. The same rule applies for both sides.

Mr Healey asked the committee members if there were any questions?

Ray Dawes asked if maintenance of properties are being kept up to scratch?

Bob Corbett advised yes.

Trevor Sansom asked if the land that has been relinquished near the railway station had been sold?

Bob Corbett answered “not as far as he was aware.” Discussion took place in respect to the block of land and if anyone else could buy the land and mine?

Julie Moloney advised that in NSW a company cannot just submit an application for a coal exploration licence. There is a pre-approval process called Minister’s Consent to apply for an application (Section 13 of Mining Act). The original EL for the GRL project were granted prior to this area being in a mineral allocation area. You cannot just apply there is the pre-approval process.

Ian Jackson raised points in relation to the residents of Forbesdale:

- Where is duty of care and who is going to take responsibility for people’s health? The wind and dust is a big issue. Sixty (60) year old people are dying from cancer;
- A Safety Bulletin from Trade & Investment was handed to Mr Healey and circulated to the committee;
- People living within one kilometre of the mine will be left. He can’t sell his property as it is worth nothing. He has two (2) small children.
- Government and politicians need to be accountable for their decisions and the effect on the local people.

Further discussion took place in respect to impact on whole community, property prices and diligence required by mining companies.

Ian Jackson acknowledged Gloucester Council for being proactive testing water tanks and monitoring water.

Tony Tersteeg advised it is an eighteen (18) month project funded by AGL for Council to hire an independent water scientist who will work with AGL. It is very good cooperation with AGL.

Mr Healey asked Tony Tersteeg to convey back to the Council his invitation to re-join the

meeting and if Mr Gardner would like to re-attend as Mr Healey thinks it is important he attend so the community is adequately represented.

Tony Tersteeg commented that Mr Gardner indicated that it is an exploration CCC and there isn't any exploring being done. He will pass on Mr Healey's message.

Ray Dawes asked if the mine is approved what modelling does GRL have in relation the effects of dust and noise?

Bob Corbett gave an overview on the procedures followed by the company.

Next meeting Friday 11 July 2014 at 10.00 am

Meeting closed at 11.30 am