

# 7 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

## 7.1 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS

### Issue:

It was suggested that the stakeholder consultation process was inadequate.

**Submissions:** 6, 20, 51, 68, 78, 211, 212, 213, 224, 230, 263, 281, 333 and 385

### Response:

Communities in the Olympic Dam region, Upper Spencer Gulf, Eyre Peninsula, Adelaide and the Northern Territory were consulted through public meetings, briefing sessions and broad-based telephone surveys during the development of the Draft EIS and on release of the document.

The consultation and engagement program was designed to accommodate the project options being assessed and to provide opportunities for continuing community and stakeholder feedback. The Olympic Dam expansion project website received 39,000 hits during the preparation of the document. Around 8,300 people had face-to-face discussions with the project team during the development of the Draft EIS. In addition, over 700 people attended public forums held during the public exhibition phase to discuss the Draft EIS with the technical specialists who undertook the studies (these forums were held at Roxby Downs, Port Augusta, Whyalla, Adelaide, Darwin and Alice Springs).

BHP Billiton will continue to consult with a variety of stakeholders on the proposed expansion. Stakeholder interaction will continue throughout the project construction, operation and decommissioning phases, where relevant.

The proposed Social Management Plan would also establish programs for consultation and communication with the community and other stakeholders on the proposed expansion and emerging issues.

Consultation and engagement with the Australian, South Australian, Northern Territory and local governments would also continue throughout the project's phases.

## 7.2 PUBLIC EXHIBITION PERIOD

### Issue:

It was suggested that the time allocated to the public exhibition of the Draft EIS was inadequate for members of the public to be able to read, understand and comment.

**Submissions:** 15, 95, 102, 173, 230, 240, 257 and 331

### Response:

The 14-week period was set by the Australian, South Australian and Northern Territory governments, believing this was adequate time for members of the public to respond to the Draft EIS. The period was more than double the statutory requirements of each of the governments: Australian (not fewer than 20 business days), South Australian (six weeks) and Northern Territory (not fewer than 28 days).

Since 2005, BHP Billiton has implemented a consultation and engagement program to identify issues and concerns about the expansion. These issues have been considered in the planning and design of the proposed expansion (refer Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS for details). Before the Draft EIS was published, numerous opportunities were provided for interested parties to comment on the proposed expansion via dedicated telephone hotlines, web pages and face-to-face meetings. During the 14-week public exhibition period, meetings and/or multiple day information sessions were held in Roxby Downs, Port Augusta, Whyalla, Adelaide, Darwin and Alice Springs.

### 7.3 LANDING FACILITY STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

**Issue:**

Information was sought about the key concerns raised by affected landholders surrounding the landing facility, and whether BHP Billiton had committed to ongoing consultation and engagement with those stakeholders.

**Submission: 2****Response:**

As presented in Section 7.3.2 of the Draft EIS, stakeholders associated with the proposed landing facility south of Port Augusta were consulted as a part of the overall stakeholder engagement and consultation process. These stakeholders included:

- coastal home owners adjacent to Shack Road
- freehold property owners
- Port Augusta Coastal Homes Association
- Port Augusta City Council
- Northern Regional Development Board
- Port Augusta City Council's Marine Advisory Committee
- South Australian Government.

The key concerns raised by affected landholders included:

- potential impact on amenity and lifestyle
- potential impact on the marine environment
- potential restrictions to access for recreational activities in Upper Spencer Gulf.

The issues raised by stakeholders were examined in detail as a part of the Draft EIS and were addressed in Chapter 14, Noise and Vibration; Chapter 16, Marine Environment; Chapter 19, Social Environment; and Chapter 20, Visual Amenity. Some of these issues were again raised in submissions to the Draft EIS and are addressed further in the relevant sections of the Supplementary EIS.

Section 7.4 of the Draft EIS explained that if the project were to be approved, a program of continuing consultation would be undertaken to address community issues as the project progressed. Interaction with all stakeholders, including those associated with the landing facility, would continue throughout the project construction, operation and decommissioning phases, where appropriate.

### 7.4 FUTURE STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

**Issue:**

Clarification was sought about present and future consultation with affected groundwater users and pastoralists.

**Submissions: 2 and 251****Response:**

Section 12.6.3 of the Draft EIS indicated that there would be no impact on third party groundwater users/pastoralists as a result of the proposed expansion of Olympic Dam. Subsequent modelling undertaken after the publication of the Draft EIS has established that the area affected by groundwater drawdown would be larger than that originally predicted, largely due to a revision of the model inputs as a result of further groundwater modelling undertaken for the OZ Minerals Prominent Hill mine (see Section 12.5.7 of the Supplementary EIS for details).

Potential impacts to two third party groundwater users may now occur and the details of the timing and likely extent of this impact are discussed in Section 12.5.7 of the Supplementary EIS.

With regard to consultation, groundwater users and pastoralists within 60 km of Olympic Dam were consulted about the expansion and as part of the baseline groundwater assessment (refer Chapters 7 and 12 and Appendices H and K of the Draft EIS).

Pastoralists on Olympic Dam's neighbouring properties were also visited to discuss the project face-to-face. Pastoralists in the project area were also consulted to establish the extent of groundwater use, via a questionnaire and follow-up site visit. A survey

of pastoralists whose properties lay in the southern infrastructure corridor was also conducted in 2006 to seek their views on the project, and on potential issues and impacts. Where specific aspects of the project, such as off-site infrastructure, could potentially affect pastoral properties, landholders have been visited and there has been continuing consultation. Meetings have also been held with various pastoralist groups to talk broadly about the expansion proposal.

As indicated in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS, if the expansion is approved, a program of ongoing consultation would be undertaken to address community interests and issues as the project progressed. Interaction with the large group of stakeholders, including pastoralists, who have already been consulted during the planning phase, would continue throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. As noted in Section 19.5.6 of the Draft EIS, BHP Billiton would also continue discussions with directly affected pastoralists and other landholders in relation to infrastructure easements, including land access, fencing along access tracks, crossing points for pastoral activities and strategies for dealing with potential incidents during construction and operation.

**Issue:**

Clarification was sought about future consultation with the Department of Defence in relation to the construction and operation of infrastructure and how that may affect the department's operations, both at the Woomera Prohibited Area (WPA) and the Cultana Training Area (CTA).

**Submissions:** 1 and 27

**Response:**

As outlined in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS, the proposed expansion interacts with the Woomera Prohibited Area (WPA) and the Cultana Training Area (CTA) as follows:

- WPA – new airport for Category 4 jet aircraft within the restricted airspace. New rail, power and water lines along the eastern boundary
- CTA – access corridor along the eastern boundary. New water pipeline in the existing gas line easement, which would be within the expanded CTA.

BHP Billiton has continued to communicate with the Department of Defence throughout the development of the Draft EIS. This would continue throughout the project planning, construction and ultimately the ongoing operational activities for the expanded Olympic Dam.

The Department of Defence has given BHP Billiton approval for minor encroachment of the above proposed infrastructure on the WPA and CTA. As further investigations for the expansion progressed, BHP Billiton would seek the appropriate approvals and permits to facilitate the construction and operation of the water, power, access and rail corridors.

In relation to the proposed new airport, discussions over the proposed flight paths through the airspace surrounding the WPA to the proposed new airport identified potential impacts and disruptions to Defence operations. The department lodged an Airspace Change Proposal in 2009 with the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) to restructure the airspace, allowing jet aircraft access to the new airport 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

## 7.5 ROXBY DOWNS DRAFT MASTER PLAN FUTURE CONSULTATION

**Issue:**

Information was sought about further opportunities to comment on the Roxby Downs Draft Master Plan.

**Submission:** 168

**Response:**

The Roxby Downs Draft Master Plan was developed with input from residents of the town, service providers and others with an interest in the town's future. A State Government Development Plan Amendment (DPA) to the Roxby Downs Development Plan would be required to put the provisions of the Master Plan into effect.

Consultation on the DPA concluded on 7 August 2009. The Development Policy Advisory Committee will consider the consultation information and report to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning, who would then make a decision about the DPA. Questions about further information and opportunities to comment on the Roxby Downs Master Plan should be directed to the South Australian Government, with information available at <<http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/go/roxbydownsdpa>>.

## 7.6 ONGOING PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

### Issue:

It was questioned whether environmental monitoring data and reporting would be made available to the public.

**Submissions:** 194 and 248

### Response:

Environmental monitoring data and reporting for the Olympic Dam operation is made publicly available via the annual Environmental Management and Monitoring Report and this public reporting would continue for the expanded operation.

Monitoring is an important component of the environmental management program at Olympic Dam. A program for the review and update of existing monitoring programs has commenced to meet the new requirements resulting from the proposed expansion (see Chapter 29 of the Supplementary EIS for details). This review has resulted in the introduction of new monitoring programs, including:

- marine flora and fauna – to monitor species associated with marine activities, including the desalination plant, together with a species-specific monitoring program for the Australian Giant Cuttlefish.
- marine water quality – to monitor water quality for activities at the desalination plant.

Olympic Dam is subject to quarterly government inspections and provides quarterly environmental reports. The annual Environment Management and Monitoring Report is submitted to the Australian and South Australian governments and is available publicly via the South Australian Department of Primary Industries and Resources website <[http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/minerals/sa\\_mines/approved\\_mines/olympic\\_dam](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/minerals/sa_mines/approved_mines/olympic_dam)>.

The existing environmental management system would continue to be used to implement environmental management, monitoring and reporting for the proposed expansion.

## 7.7 COMPENSATION

### Issue:

Submissions asked whether compensation would be available to stakeholders in relation to the potential impacts of some project components, including the landing facility, access corridor, desalination plant and the open pit.

**Submissions:** 2, 61, 63, 68, 71, 79, 120, 122, 135, 158, 211, 212, 261, 263, 272, 274, 276, 333, 334, 346, 354 and 357

### Response:

Discussions have already been undertaken with stakeholders who may be directly affected by the proposed expansion. These discussions have included the issue of appropriate compensation.

As presented in Chapter 19 of the Draft EIS, maintaining the amenity and social fabric of communities in the EIS Study Area was a project planning, design and operational management objective. A major consideration of the project design phase included siting project infrastructure to reduce potential impacts on stakeholders associated with the project. For example, the location of the landing facility was chosen to minimise the number of coastal homes that would be affected, in addition to reducing environmental impacts. In addition, the access corridor has been realigned (see Section 5.7.3 of the Supplementary EIS) to take account of existing and future residential development, to minimise the number of residences potentially affected by noise and visual impacts, and to reduce access and traffic impacts.

While the Draft EIS acknowledged that certain stakeholders could experience some disturbance, inconvenience and loss of amenity associated with the construction and operation of some of the project components, BHP Billiton has committed to implementing a series of mitigation measures to reduce short- and long-term impacts. BHP Billiton would monitor the construction and operation of all project components and their impacts on the surrounding areas and maintain consultation with affected stakeholders. BHP Billiton would undertake ongoing consultation and negotiation with stakeholders, with the intention of ensuring suitable arrangements are in place to enable stakeholders and infrastructure to coexist. BHP Billiton would provide regular updates to stakeholders of activities as detailed planning progressed and would provide advance notice of construction activities and transport movements to reduce access or disturbance issues.